



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PART II

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY FOR COLORADO COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION

On July 6, 1917, at a special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Colorado College, action was taken creating a "special executive committee" with full authority to "suspend, in whole or in part, any department of instruction, call for and enforce the resignation, permanently or temporarily, of any member of the faculty or any employee, change or revise the course of instruction, and to do all other such things . . . in the transition from the former administration of Dr. Slocum to that of the newly elected President, as this Board, itself, might or could do if acting directly there-upon."* Thirteen members of the board were present at this meeting, of whom one, Mr. W. R. Armstrong, a representative of the alumni of the college, voted against this action.

The committee appointed under this authority consisted of Messrs. Philip B. Stewart, E. P. Shove, Irving Howbert, C. H. Shoup, and William Lennox. On the 8th of July, immediately before going into conference with members of the faculty, this committee requested the resignation of two professors—Edward S. Parsons, Dean of the Department of Arts and Science, and Professor of English, and Guy H. Albright, Professor of Mathematics. Both men refused to resign, or to admit that there were any grounds on which their resignation could properly be demanded. No further action was taken by the executive committee in regard to Professor Albright; but on July 9th it addressed a formal notice of dismissal to Dean Parsons.

Dean Parsons at once requested an investigation by this Association of the circumstances connected with his dismissal; and similar requests came to President Thilly from several of his colleagues, and also from the Denver Branch of the Alumni Association of Colorado College.

*Extract from minutes, furnished by President Duniway.

Extracts from these communications are subjoined to this report as Appendix A. The complaints and charges contained in them may be summarized as follows:

- (1) That Dean Parsons had been summarily dismissed, without any specific statement of grounds for dismissal, and without any judicial hearing in regard to these grounds or charges;
- (2) That the real immediate cause for this arbitrary action of the trustees was resentment of the part which Dean Parsons had taken, in a course of action which brought about the resignation of Dr. W. F. Slocum as President of the College; although his responsibility for this was fully shared by many of his colleagues, and the course of action in question had been fully warranted by the circumstances;
- (3) That there was no just ground for the dismissal of Dean Parsons.

Upon the receipt of these complaints the then Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, Professor A. A. Young, addressed a letter of inquiry to the retiring president of Colorado College, Dr. W. F. Slocum. Dr. Slocum referred him to the Chairman of the executive committee of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Philip B. Stewart, from whom, on the renewal of this inquiry, a brief and uninforming reply was received.

Having considered these circumstances, and information received from persons not connected with Colorado College, the committee decided that an investigation was necessary. But since various plans for an amicable settlement of the controversy were proposed during the months following this decision, no immediate action was taken. Finally, at the middle of November, since none of these plans were accepted by both parties to the controversy, a sub-committee was appointed to investigate and report, as follows: Edmund H. Hollands, Professor of Philosophy, University of Kansas, Chairman; F. S. Deibler, Professor of Economics, Northwestern University; George Lefevre, Professor of Zoology, University of Missouri; John L. Lowes, Professor of English, Washington University (now of Harvard University); Herbert A. Miller, Professor of Sociology, Oberlin College.

The investigation was carried on by interviews, personal examinations of witnesses, and correspondence, the greater part of the testimony being in each case ultimately reduced to the form of deposition under oath. Members of the sub-committee visited

Colorado Springs twice, the chairman from November 29th to December 2, 1917, and the chairman and Professor Lefevre from March 1 to March 3, 1918. During the first visit, interviews were held with the present president of Colorado College, Dr. C. A. Duniway, and with many members of the faculty and others who could testify in regard to matters connected with the dismissal of Dean Parsons. During the second visit, a meeting took place with six of the trustees, including Mr. Stewart, and President Duniway, and many other persons were also interviewed or examined. The collecting of testimony and evidence by correspondence continued for several months thereafter.

At the request of gentlemen representing Dr. Slocum, members of the sub-committee, and members of the general committee acting for the sub-committee, have held four conferences with them. On May 13, 1918, the chairman of the sub-committee, assisted by Professor F. H. Hodder of the general committee, conferred with President Cowling of Carleton College. On July 24, Professor Miller of the sub-committee conferred with Messrs. Slocum, Peabody, Hendrickson, and Matchett, in New York City. On August 30, Chairman Young of the general committee conferred with Professor G. L. Hendrickson of Yale University, in New York. On March 22 and 23, 1919, in New York, President A. O. Lovejoy, assisted by Professor E. H. Wilkins of the University of Chicago, held a prolonged conference with Professor Hendrickson and President Cowling representing Dr. Slocum, and Professors Parsons and Albright.

As a result of this investigation, the sub-committee now submits the following report.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FACTS

The facts following are stated as not disputed by any of the parties to this controversy, and because some information in regard to them is necessary in order to understand the matters at issue.

Colorado College was founded in 1874. It is a co-educational institution, and in the academic year 1917-18 there were in attendance 552 students, besides 69 in the School of Music. The Congregational Church has been closely connected with the foundation and

growth of the institution; but its constitution provides that it "shall never be under the control of a sect" and that "no trustee, officer, member of any faculty, or student, shall ever be required to belong to any specified sect, and no theological test shall ever be imposed or applied."

The Constitution provides for a board of not less than twelve and not more than eighteen trustees, seven of whom shall constitute a quorum; and that "the Board of Trustees shall have power by vote of a quorum to fill vacancies in the Board." The by-laws appended to this constitution define the powers and duties of committees of the board, of the president, the treasurer, and the librarian. There is no article of the by-laws which deals with the place and function of the faculty in the college; it is incidentally prescribed that "academic degrees shall be conferred by vote of the Trustees upon recommendation of the Faculty," that the faculty may, with the trustees, establish regulations in regard to the chapel services, and that the faculty may expel students without warning if they judge it necessary. There is no provision in regard to the mode of appointment or of dismissal of members of the faculty, except that the president is given power to suspend them at his discretion.*

Article III, "Of the President's Office," contains the following provisions:

"He shall be the official medium of communication between the teaching force of the College and the Board of Trustees." "He shall supervise the work of all departments of the College and he may suspend any officer, agent, teacher or employee of the College, reporting his reasons therefor to the next meeting of the Board of Trustees." "All Committees of the Faculty shall be appointed by the President." "The President may make temporary appointments upon the faculty until the next meeting of the Trustees." "He may designate a full professor in each department to act as executive head of the department, such executive head to hold office at the will of the President."

From 1888 until June 1917, Dr. William F. Slocum was President of Colorado College. Eleven new buildings were erected during his administration, and the college grew and prospered.

*Amendments to this constitution and by-laws, providing for the election of four alumni trustees, and for faculty consultation in regard to appointments, promotions, and dismissals, have recently been adopted.

Dr. Edward S. Parsons became head professor of English in Colorado College in 1892. He was for many years, and until his dismissal, Dean of the Department of Arts and Science; and also, for a somewhat shorter period, Vice-President of the college. He resigned the latter position in the year 1916-17.

In 1911, Professor Parsons and another member of the faculty (Professor M. C. Gile, since deceased) brought to the attention of the attorney for the college, Mr. Henry C. Hall, now Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, certain apparent discrepancies in published statements regarding the college funds, and reports in regard to the use of moneys, contributed to endowment funds, for other purposes. Mr. Hall laid the matter before Mr. P. B. Stewart, a member of the finance committee of the trustees, and he in turn took it to the president. Eventually a certified accountant was employed to audit the books of the college, and at the end of this audit he reported that all the money paid in had been accounted for.

In November, 1915, serious charges of indiscreet and improper conduct on the part of President Slocum towards two women employed in the college offices were reported to Dean Parsons by one of the women concerned, who also communicated these charges to Professor Edward C. Schneider, of the Department of Biology. These gentlemen called into consultation two other members of the faculty—Florian Cajori, Professor of Mathematics, and Dean of the Department of Engineering, and E. C. Hills, Professor of Romance Languages. On November 21 the two women in question appeared before this group of four professors, and wrote out signed statements of their charges.

Late in December, or early in January, 1916, these charges were reported to a former trustee, in a way to be discussed later, and were by him communicated to three members of the board—Messrs. Irving Howbert and P. B. Stewart, of Colorado Springs, and Judge John Campbell, of Denver. During the months which followed, Messrs. Howbert and Stewart conferred with the four members of the faculty in regard to the charges and the course of action to be adopted in consequence of them. They also interviewed the two women who had made the original charges, to which others had now been added. They did not, however, inform President Slocum of these charges until April 17, when he absolutely denied all of them.

At the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees, held June 13,

President Slocum presented his resignation, to take effect at a later date, and stated that he intended to be absent from the college from about October 1, in order to raise a large endowment fund in the East. He also recommended the appointment of a faculty administrative committee, to take charge of the internal affairs of the college until his successor could be appointed. The trustees laid his resignation on the table, but appointed an administrative committee of five, including the three academic deans—Cajori, Parsons, and W. M. Persons (School of Banking and Commerce). There was some criticism of the size and membership of this committee, and a day or two later the President agreed to recommend that it should consist of the three deans only.

In the middle of August Dean Parsons informed Professors Cajori and Hills that Mr. P. B. Stewart had told him that the trustees resented the criticism of their original committee, that they had abolished the committee and put the control of the college back in the hands of President Slocum until his successor should be appointed, which might not be for a long time. Thereupon a conference of faculty members in and near Colorado Springs was called, and the charges against the President laid before them. This enlarged group consisted of eleven full professors, one assistant professor, and the college librarian. There were at this time sixteen full professors on the faculty of the college. A part of the faculty were away, as it was vacation time, and Professor Schneider was ill.

This conference drew up and signed a letter of remonstrance, copies of which were sent to each member of the board of trustees, dated August 19, 1916. The following extract will indicate sufficiently the purport of this letter: "The undersigned members of the faculty, cognizant of the facts, feel that if all the trustees clearly understood the whole situation, they would agree with them as to the practical impossibility of carrying on the college under the leadership of President Slocum. The faculty do not seek controversy; they appreciate the great work President Slocum has done for Colorado College. They wish to co-operate with the trustees in the aim, common to both, of avoiding scandal and promoting the welfare of President Slocum himself and of the College."

As a result of this letter, a joint meeting of trustees and faculty members was called, which met on the evening of August 28, and lasted for six hours. There were present eleven members of the

board and eleven of the faculty. At the conclusion of the meeting the trustees proposed that the faculty should nominate six professors from whom they would appoint an administrative committee of three members, to take charge of the internal affairs of the college from October 1. The committee thus formed consisted of Professor Cajori, Professor Schneider, and Professor Parish (History).

September 1, announcement was made in the press of the resignation of President Slocum, to take effect at the end of the academic year 1916-17, and of the appointment of a faculty executive Committee to administer the college during his proposed absence from Colorado Springs, and until a successor could be appointed.

About the time of the College opening the Trustees appointed this executive committee, as mentioned above, with Dean Cajori as chairman. The college opened with President Slocum in charge; but the committee took charge after his departure for the East about the middle of October, co-operating with an executive committee of the trustees consisting of Messrs. Stewart, Howbert, and Armstrong, and remained in charge during the academic year, although it was not allowed the exercise of all the powers of the President.

In June, 1917, on the occasion of the retirement of President Slocum, the Board of Trustees, at its commencement meeting, made him president emeritus for life, conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws, and adopted resolutions of praise and thanks for his services to Colorado College and his influence upon its students. These resolutions were signed by every member of the Board.

July 6, the Board of Trustees held the special meeting mentioned in the introduction of this report, at which the special executive committee was appointed by the resolution there quoted. The following day an intimation was printed in a local newspaper that certain members of the faculty were to be dismissed. July 8, a conference took place, at which were present the special executive committee of the trustees and seventeen members of the faculty. The proceedings and nature of this conference will be discussed later. July 9, a formal notice of dismissal, already mentioned, was sent to Dean Parsons by the special executive committee.

Occurrences later than this date will be considered in connection with the evidence, in the findings of the committee.

FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

I. THE MANNER OF THE DISMISSAL OF DEAN PARSONS

Dean Cajori, the witness most fully informed in regard to the circumstances immediately precedent and subsequent to the dismissal of Dean Parsons, testifies as follows:

On Saturday, July 7, our local morning paper had an article indicating that certain members of the faculty would probably be asked to leave. I at once felt that something very serious was to happen, and started out, immediately after breakfast, to see trustees; the other two members of the (faculty) executive committee were out of town. . . . I met Mr. Howbert on the way to his bank and asked whether I could have a talk with him on college matters. He said that we might take it up at once and took me to his office. He told me that the Board was about to ask for the resignation of two members of the faculty, Mr. Parsons and Mr. Albright. I endeavored to point out the seriousness to the college of such a step, and asked what charges they had, or thought they had, against these men. Mr. Howbert said that in the case of Mr. Albright they had information showing that he had been giving out the charges against President Slocum to the students, while the Trustees had all been trying to keep them concealed. He brought no definite charges against Mr. Parsons. I told him that I was very much afraid that the Trustees were mistaken as to the facts in connection with Mr. Albright, and that I knew of nothing which Mr. Parsons had done that would justify the Board in dismissing him. I felt that I had made some impression upon him in regard to Mr. Albright, but none at all in regard to Mr. Parsons. He suggested that I see Mr. Shove and I went to see him. A few minutes later two other trustees, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Fowler, joined us, and we discussed the matter for about two hours. Nothing new came up concerning Professor Albright, but the case of Professor Parsons was very fully gone over. I tried to make them feel that there must be some mistake on their part as to the facts; I endeavored to find out what charges they had against Professor Parsons. They mentioned three charges:

(1) That Professor Parsons had seized every opportunity to spread the charges against President Slocum among the townspeople. I replied that this charge was untrue, that I had been very close to him, and felt sure that he did not do so, except that on certain occasions, when serious charges against his character were brought to his friends, he felt that he had the right to defend himself, and had explained to these friends how he came, in conjunction with the other three members of the faculty, to act against President Slocum.

(2) That Professor Parsons had tried to induce newspapers to publish the charges against President Slocum. I replied that knowing Parsons as I did, I was absolutely certain that this charge was baseless. (Professor Schneider can supply pertinent testimony in regard to this accusation.)

(3) The third charge I may have partly misunderstood. As I gathered it at the time, it was that the trustees had letters written by Dean Parsons asking the persons addressed to bring the charges against Mr. Slocum to the attention of other parties, but asking that Mr. Parsons' name be withheld in connection with them. I replied that if this and the other two charges were true, I would be ready to revise my judgment of Dean Parsons.

The Trustees also said that they could not work with Dean Parsons; either he must leave or eight of the trustees must resign. Which was more important to the College, they asked me; the eight trustees, or the one member of the faculty? I replied that the controversy was not so much one of men as one of justice; that Colorado College could not afford to do injustice to any man. I said that the chief disagreement between themselves and me was as to the facts of the Parsons case; that the Faculty was in a position to know a great deal about the inner life of a college which the Trustees could not know. For that reason I urged that the Trustees and Faculty meet together and go over the charges against Parsons and Albright, with a view to ascertaining the facts. Mr. Shove consented to this proposal at once, and Mr. Stewart consented reluctantly. It was agreed that this joint meeting should take place next day, Sunday afternoon, in the Administrative Building.

When the time for this meeting had arrived, Mr. Shove told me that the trustees, who were in the President's office, wished to see Mr. Parsons and Mr. Albright alone for a few moments. Parsons was not willing to go in unless I accompanied him; to this the trustees consented. When we entered the office, Mr. Shove, acting as chairman, rose from his chair, and said that at a general meeting of the Trustees a few days previous, it was voted that the committee of the Trustees here present be given power to ask for the resignation of Dean Parsons, but that before doing so the committee wished to give him the opportunity of resigning of his own accord. Mr. Parsons said that he would like to have time to consider this, and that he understood that this meeting had been called for the purpose of ascertaining the facts. Mr. Parsons said that he thought he could give an answer to the committee before the close of the meeting that afternoon. He was then excused from the room, I remaining. Mr. Albright was called in, and somewhat the same procedure was gone through. He also asked for time to think over the question of his voluntary resignation. Then the trustees came into the larger room where the faculty were (seventeen of them), and on my motion, Mr. Shove was made chairman of the joint meeting. He began by asking the pleasure of the meeting. There was an embarrassing silence of several moments, and I felt that if the chairman was not prepared to make a statement as to the object of the meeting, then I must do so. I stated that the meeting had been called with a view to going over the charges against Professor Parsons and Professor Albright with a view to ascertaining the real facts in regard to them. Some of the trustees then referred to Parsons' connection with the rumors in 1911 of irregularity in the use of college funds. Parsons said that he expected that this point would be brought up and, accordingly, he had prepared a written statement of the part he took. Following the reading of his statement, heated remarks passed back and forth. A trustee remarked that at that time, six years ago, the Trustees felt that Parsons should be asked to resign. A faculty member stated that Professor Gile and Dean Parsons acted together in this matter; he asked the trustees present, why they had not thought of asking for Gile's resignation. Mr. Stewart replied, "Well, Gile is dead," and by this remark closed the discussion at this point. There seemed no disposition on the part of the trustees to enter upon the consideration of other charges against Dean Parsons. So I finally arose and stated the three charges (against Dean Parsons) which had been named by trustees to me at the informal meeting the day before. I repeated my statement of the day before, that I was

ready to revise my judgment of the conduct of Dean Parsons, if these charges against him could be substantiated by facts. Again I remarked that the object of this meeting was to ascertain the *facts*. The chairman replied that my statement of the charges was not altogether accurate, that the Trustees did not claim that Parsons "had seized *every opportunity*" to spread among townspeople the charges against the former President, nor (said the chairman) were the Trustees in possession of letters written by Parsons himself, requesting the charges against the former President be transmitted to third parties but that his (Parsons') name be withheld. Mr. Stewart then read part of a sentence taken from a letter written by an alumnus (I cannot now recall the passage), and asked Parsons whether he had said that. Parsons was not able to answer either yes or no, but asked Mr. Stewart to read the whole sentence, or better yet, the whole letter. Mr. Stewart refused and remarked that he would not now reveal the author or read the letter. About this time Parsons said that he had decided *not* to resign of his own free will. Mr. Stewart stated that the Trustees were not inclined to discuss the details of the three charges named in my presence the day before. Thereupon, a member of the faculty remarked that the purpose of the meeting was to ascertain the facts, that if the Trustees were not willing to do this, then it was best to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was carried. Some hostile remarks were made. Parsons was asked why he desired an investigation by the Association of University Professors. In anger he replied "Because I want the rottenness in the administration of Colorado College shown up." (These were not the exact words, but the word rottenness was used). Mr. Shove replied immediately, "I ask for your resignation right now." Parsons answered, "I refuse to resign." A day later Parsons wrote Mr. Shove an apology for using the word "rotteness" and explained carefully what he really had in mind. On July 10, Parsons received a written statement of his dismissal.

A few days later I went to see Mr. Howbert, to secure his consent to a certain appointment to the faculty for the year following. Mr. Howbert then remarked that the trustees had been hasty in their action in the case of Professor Albright, and had decided to give him a hearing. I asked Mr. Howbert whether they could not extend the same privilege to Dean Parsons. He shook his head in a determined manner and stated that some recent doings of Parsons had come to their knowledge which made it impossible to grant him a hearing. I remarked that for the good of "old C. C." I hoped the Trustees would grant him a hearing, and then went off.

On July 17, 1917, Dr. Schneider and I mailed a letter of protest, against the action of the Trustees in the dismissal of Dean Parsons, to each of the trustees residing in Colorado Springs, Denver and Pueblo. Only one of the trustees acknowledged the receipt of this letter; no action was taken by them.

On July 21, 1917, Dr. Schneider and I handed to Mr. Stewart, as Chairman of the executive committee of the Trustees, a formal request that their charges against Dean Parsons be put in writing and that he be given a full hearing. No reply to this letter was received by Dr. Schneider or myself until after November 16, 1917.*

*Extract from deposition of Dean Cajori, dated December 2nd, 1917, and Jan. 7th, 1918. The two letters referred to in the last paragraph are added to this report as Appendix B.

Dean Cajori's account of the meeting of July 8th is corroborated by the testimony of Professors Parsons, Albright, Noyes (English) and Howe (German). It is also in agreement, in most important respects, with a more detailed account of this meeting, which was written out on the day of its occurrence by H. E. Woodbridge, Professor of English. One passage from this account may be quoted, as it supplements and in part corrects the later account of Dean Cajori:

There was another pause after Dean Cajori's statement of the purpose of the meeting, and Dr. Cajori asked whether he might repeat the substance of what the members of the Board had said to him yesterday concerning these men. There was no objection, and he began mentioning charges against Parsons:—that in the matter of the charges of financial irregularity in handling college money brought by Parsons and Gile in 1911, Parsons had not gone directly to the Board, but to a lawyer, and that the charges had come indirectly to the Board. The trustees admitted that this was one charge against Parsons, and Parsons read a written answer to it, in which he said that he and Gile had consulted the college lawyer, Mr. H. C. Hall, and that they both wished, when the proper time came, to bring the charges directly to the President. Through no fault of theirs or Mr. Hall's, the matter had come to the President through a back door. Asked by Mr. Fowler how this had happened, Parsons said that Mr. Hall, against the advice of himself and Gile, had consulted Mr. Stewart, who had felt it his duty to go to the President with the charges. Hall, Parsons said, was shocked to hear that Stewart had done this. Stewart then gave his account of the affair, insisting that Hall had not said a word to him of secrecy, and saying that he, as was his custom in dealing with his friends, had gone straight to the President, and laid the charges directly before him. An investigation was at once determined upon, to account for every gift ever made to the College from the beginning. This was carried out by the regular professional accountants of the First National Bank, and the accountants congratulated the College on the rarely successful handling of the money. President Slocum was much worried over the affair, Stewart said, as financial integrity was one of his most striking traits, and to be attacked on that ground was a severe blow to him. I asked whether it was not a little too late to dismiss a man for something he was known, by the trustees, to have done five years ago. Shove said that it had been then proposed to ask Parsons to resign, but that Slocum had interceded for him. Howe asked whether any such action toward Gile had been contemplated. Someone among the trustees answered merely, "Gile is dead." Shove added that anyway this was not the cause of Parsons' dismissal; the sole cause was merely lack of harmony between him and the trustees. The trustees did not feel that they could work with him longer. This was repeated on, I believe, at least two other occasions. The trustees would bring no specific charges. Fowler with some heat remarked that Parsons' calling Stewart, a member of the Board, a 'back door,' was enough in itself to show his attitude towards the Board.*

It will be remembered that Dean Cajori was chairman of the

*Statement of H. E. Woodbridge, written July 8th, 1917, and sworn to Dec. 21st.

faculty executive committee. Another member of this committee states that "at the first meeting between the faculty executive committee and the corresponding trustee committee, a reference to Dean Parsons brought out very heated and caustic remarks; and throughout the year there were frequent indications and expressions of this feeling, but there were also frequent statements made by the Trustees that they had no intention of asking for his resignation."*

Dean Cajori also testifies that shortly after June 13, 1917, he was told by a member of the faculty that he had heard rumors that "something drastic will be done in regard to Mr. Parsons," but "I replied that I had been repeatedly in touch with some of the trustees on college matters since commencement, and had received no such impression; that the Trustees seemed to be inclined to co-operate with me, and that in my judgment what he had heard was idle gossip."† His first intimation that this was not the case came, as already noted, through the newspapers, and after the Trustees had already taken action to bring about the dismissal or resignation of Dean Parsons.

It is plain from the events which immediately followed that the dismissal of Dean Parsons was the real purpose of the action of the Board on July 6, although the resolution mentioned financial difficulties as the reason for the extraordinary powers of suspending courses, dismissing instructors, and so forth, conferred by it upon the special committee of five trustees. This committee also acknowledged that to bring about the resignation or dismissal of Messrs. Parsons and Albright was its immediate purpose and function. In a statement written out on July 13th, when the facts were fresh in his memory, Professor Albright says that when he was called into the President's office to meet the Trustees, immediately before the joint meeting, "Mr. Shove said that on Friday with fourteen members of the board present it was voted to empower the committee then assembled to ask my resignation when they saw fit. One member had been excused from voting because of his short service on the board. One had voted against them. (They referred to Armstrong.) Hence they were now willing to receive my resignation."‡

*Statement of John C. Parish, Professor of History, December 23, 1917.

†Deposition of Florian Cajori.

‡Statement of Guy H. Albright, written July 13, 1917, and certified December 2.

Further quotation of testimony under this head appears to be unnecessary, and comment upon that already quoted would be superfluous. The committee of inquiry finds that the manner of the dismissal of Dean Parsons was arbitrary and unjust. After repeated assurances that his position was secure, and some four weeks after commencement, the Board of Trustees decided to dismiss him. No intimation of their intention was given either to Dean Parsons or to the faculty administrative authority. No formal statement of the grounds of their action was made. No real hearing was granted to Dean Parsons, even on the charges which had been informally, unwillingly, and, so to speak, accidentally, stated to Dean Cajori. Under the most favorable circumstances the meeting of July 8 could have been only a preliminary to a genuine hearing; but the trustees' committee invited the resignation of Dean Parsons before the meeting, and refused to discuss its complaints against him afterwards, when the meeting, which it evidently was unwilling to have take place, was called together. Deliberate disregard of the just rights of Dean Parsons, and of the self-respect of his colleagues, could scarcely have been carried farther.

In their letter to the alumni, dated April 5, 1918, the Trustees themselves state that "the procedure followed in the dismissal of Dean Parsons last July was summary in form, contrary to the customary practice of the College and to the policy approved by the Trustees and being followed in its administration." But they also say that "this exceptional procedure was made necessary by the attitude and acts of Dean Parsons, since the Trustees were not willing to disregard their responsibilities and to subject themselves to a control to be imposed by Mr. Parsons."^{*}

This attempted justification of the summary character of the action taken by the Trustees appears to your committee to be unworthy of serious consideration. It does not account for the equally summary character of their procedure towards Professor Albright, although to be sure they did not in his case follow their abrupt invitation to resign by dismissal after this invitation had been rejected. And we are quite unable to see why the Trustees were obliged to dismiss Mr. Parsons preemptorily, and without a hearing on stated charges, in order not "to subject themselves to a control to be imposed by" him—particularly at the date at which

*See Appendix C.

this dismissal took place. In July, 1917, Dr. Slocum had retired from the presidency of Colorado College; a new President was shortly to take his place; and a faculty executive committee, of which Dean Parsons was not a member, was in control of strictly academic affairs. The members of this executive committee testify that Dr. Parsons did not in any way interfere with or attempt to control their decisions; and there is no evidence to show that he had anything to do with the negotiations for the appointment of the new President.

II. RELATION OF THE DISMISSAL TO THE EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT SLOCUM

It has been the constant contention of the friends of Dean Parsons that the real cause for his dismissal was the resentment of the Trustees for his insisting, against their wishes, that the President must resign; and that they singled Dean Parsons out for special retaliation because they regarded him as the leader of his colleagues in this matter. The following are some typical statements of this contention, made immediately after the dismissal:

"Other reasons are assigned, but no one on the College faculty doubts what are the real reasons. . . . The only motive we actually did have was to save certain individuals and the College from most serious injury, and this would have been accomplished if it had not been for the persistent efforts of a few of the trustees and of two or three other persons who thought, and apparently still think, that might is stronger than right."*

"This trustee action arises, in the opinion of the faculty, not from the reasons given, but from the resentment of the Trustees at the active participation of these men" (*i. e.*, Parsons and Albright) "in the movement which resulted in President Slocum's resignation."†

"We believe that the attack upon these men is in essence an attack upon practically a majority of the faculty, and therefore request that the scope of the investigation be made broad enough to include the whole situation at the College beginning with the circumstances that led to Dr. Slocum's resignation."‡

*Letter of E. S. Parsons to *Denver News*, July 10, 1917.

†Letter of Professor Atherton Noyes to President Thilly of the Association, July 13, 1917. It should be noted that Professor Albright had acted as secretary of the meeting which drew up the letter to the Trustees in August, 1916.

‡Letter of Professor G. M. Howe and Professor H. E. Woodbridge to President Thilly, July 12, 1917.

"I believe that in the long run the College will profit greatly by an investigation. The question of general interest chiefly involved is, I think, that of a college teacher's liberty of action."*

The consideration of this charge involves an examination of two questions: (a) Does the evidence show, or tend to show, that the resentment of the Trustees for the activity of Dean Parsons in urging that the President should resign was the real immediate cause of their action in dismissing him? (b) Were Dean Parsons and his colleagues justified in urging the resignation of the President?

It should be noted that the Trustees have publicly denied that they dismissed Dean Parsons because of resentment for what he did in connection with the resignation of President Slocum. In a printed letter sent to the alumni, dated April 5, 1918, and signed by all the members of the Board except one, while intimating that they consider the charges against the President groundless, they say: "To put the matter in the form of a reply to assertions which have been widely circulated, the dismissal of Dean Parsons was not due to resentment against him for what he is alleged to have done in 'saving the College on a moral issue despite the indifference of the Trustees.'"[†]

It will be necessary, therefore, in considering the first question, to examine the evidence for the acts and mutual relations of those Trustees and those members of the faculty who were informed of the charges against President Slocum, from the end of the year 1915 down to the time of the dismissal and immediately thereafter, together with that for the attitude of the President and of certain trustees during this period.

Those persons who were directly concerned in bringing the charges to the attention of Messrs. Stewart and Howbert of the Board of Trustees testify that these gentlemen agreed that the resignation of the President would be necessary for the sake of the College. Dr. Mary R. Noble, a graduate of the College, to whom the charges had been reported by the two original complainants, states that these complainants were insistent that some action should be taken, and that in an interview with Messrs. Howbert and Stewart which

*Letter of H. E. Woodbridge to Secretary H. W. Tyler, July 19, 1917.

[†]This letter is printed as Appendix C.

followed they "left no doubt in my mind that they would act immediately to get the President to resign and leave. . . . I was impressed with the sense of grief that both men showed, and that they heartily agreed in the wisdom of getting President Slocum away for the sake of the College."*

Dean Parsons states that after the three trustees had been informed of the charges, "for a number of weeks there were meetings of the faculty men with Mr. Howbert and Mr. Stewart at which we were told again and again that the matter was now where it should be, in the hands of the Trustees; that it would be rightly handled by the three men without the story being told to the rest of the trustees; that we could be assured that the President would not be in authority after the College year 1915-16, or at the latest after the summer of 1916. There was complete agreement at this time, at least between the two trustees with whom we frequently met and ourselves, as to the propriety of the action the Faculty men had taken."†

The statements of the other members of the "group of four" are in agreement with this account. "At that time these two trustees agreed with the four professors that in view of the charges against President Slocum he could no longer remain at the head of a co-educational institution."‡

"At one of the first meetings that the four had at Mr. Stewart's house, Mr. Stewart said that ordinarily he did not believe in anonymous letters, but in this case he almost inclined to the plan of sending one."§

The two trustees "each said that the President could under no circumstances be allowed to retain the presidency."||

The deposition of Dean Parsons may be quoted in regard to the events which followed until the middle of June, 1918; it is confirmed in all essential points by that of Dean Cajori, and by memoranda made at the time by Professor E. C. Hills, extracts from which have been laid before the committee by him.

"In several of these joint meetings there was discussion of the way in which the College was to be handled in the interim between the President's going out and

*Depositions of Mary R. Noble, M.D.

†Deposition of E. S. Parsons.

‡Deposition of Florian Cajori.

§Letter of F. Cajori to Mr. F. Caldwell.

||Statement of E. C. Schneider.

the new President's coming in. It was agreed that the executive direction should be in the hands of a committee of the faculty—not larger than three was Mr. Stewart's opinion. In order that there might be no embarrassment to the Trustees in selecting this committee I placed, a little later, my resignation of the office of Vice-President, which I had held for seventeen years, in the hands of the Trustees to be acted on in June. I have not to date received any official recognition of the acceptance of this resignation.

"Beginning with February, 1916, I was absent from Colorado Springs for about six weeks, on a trip to the West Indies. On my return I found those who were acquainted with the facts in the faculty and the town, outside of the Trustees, restless over the fact that nothing had been done apparently to advance the case. But affairs soon came to a crisis. Anonymous letters on the situation reached the *Denver Post*, and the Trustees felt they must act, so on Monday of Holy Week the documents were laid before the President. He had conferences with Dr. Schneider and Dr. Cajori and on Thursday asked to see me. On Easter Sunday morning Mr. Stewart called the four faculty men to his house and told us that the President had informed him of his intention to resign and asked us if we would be satisfied if one of two propositions was adopted; first, that the president should resign and sever his connection with the College at the coming commencement in June; or second, that at the end of the summer he should give up all authority within the institution but retain the title through the college year while he was devoting himself to the completion of the \$500,000 additional endowment fund which was then being raised. We said that either proposition would be acceptable to us.

"Nothing further of importance happened until the latter part of May, when an unofficial meeting of the Board of Trustees was held at which the President announced his intention of resigning at the annual meeting of the Board in June. There was considerable protest against this (only the three trustees knew the cause) but it was finally accepted as necessary and it was voted that a committee of four should be authorized at the June meeting, consisting of the three academic Deans and the Secretary of the College, and that this committee should be advisory to the President. The day after the meeting Dr. Cajori and I waited on Mr. Howbert at his office in the First National Bank Building and pointed out that this arrangement was contrary to the agreement that the President should relinquish all authority within the institution and moreover that the plan would not work as outlined, because it would mean divided authority. Mr. Howbert said that he realized the truth of our contention, that the meeting had not developed as it should have developed, that Mr. Stewart came late and there was no opportunity to consult with him beforehand, that when the annual meeting came everything would be arranged as was originally planned.

"Soon after this meeting information came to our ears that the President was seeking to use his influence against us by writing here and there distorted versions of the story. This made it necessary in some cases for the whole story to be presented in self-defense, and this meant the spreading of the knowledge of the facts more and more widely. So the four faculty men had a meeting with the President June 5, 1916, and as a result he dictated in our presence the following:

"President Slocum will place his resignation formally in the hands of the Trustees at the annual meeting, June, 1916. He will remain in Colorado during the summer, and plans to work in connection with the raising of the balance of the half-million dollar fund in Colorado. Very soon after the opening of the fall term he plans to go east to continue the work of completing the fund. In order that Dr. Slocum may be entirely free to devote himself to that work the internal affairs of the College will be administered by a committee of the faculty who shall take charge not later than October 1st, 1916, and shall continue their control until the new President takes his chair."

"It was agreed that, inasmuch as this program had been determined upon by him, we would give our word, and ask all who knew the facts to give their word, that the information should be kept absolutely secret unless there should be an attempt to undermine the reputation of any of us or of those who had given testimony. Then came the annual meeting in June. The President's resignation was handed in and it was agreed that from October 1 until his successor was elected the direction of the inner life of the College should be in the hands of a committee of five, the three academic deans, the dean of women, and the secretary of the College. The meeting was held on June 13, 1916, the day before commencement."*

At this meeting of the Trustees, however, they did not accept the resignation of President Slocum, but laid it on the table. "In an interview which I had with Mr. Howbert in October, 1916, he took pains to say emphatically that President Slocum had kept faith with the faculty, for "he had promised to resign, and he did resign, but we didn't accept his resignation!"† It also appears that an earlier intention to make public announcement of the resignation was changed, for Professor George M. Howe, who had charge of the college publicity, makes the following statement:

"In May, 1916, after a regular Friday afternoon faculty meeting, Dr. Slocum asked me to step into his office for a moment. I did so, and he informed me that he would resign from the presidency of Colorado College in the coming June, and requested me to prepare suitable publicity matter concerning him. I walked from the Administration Building with him to his house, discussing details of the publicity he desired. Among other things he suggested that I see Mr. Howbert, and discuss the question of publicity and details with him, as he, Dr. Slocum, was going east and would be gone for ten days or two weeks. I saw Mr. Howbert some time later, and he said it would be better not to do anything about publicity till after Dr. Slocum's return. After his return I spoke to him again,

*Deposition of E. S. Parsons.

†Deposition of Atherton Noyes.

and he requested me to let matters rest for a while; and, later, told me that I would be given a statement after the regular meeting of the board of trustees on the Tuesday before commencement day. I obtained the statement late Tuesday afternoon, and after it had been already sent to the *Telegraph*. . . . I remember when it was put in my hands I commented on the fact that it seemed to have no bearing on the resignation of the President, and was without news value from the standpoint of the press."* "At the commencement exercises, no notice of any change in Mr. Slocum's plans was made."†

The four professors did not consider the committee of five appointed by the Trustees a suitable one. Dean Cajori says: "Professor Parsons and I objected to the committee as being too large, and that it would not be harmonious. . . . Parsons went further and refused to take a place on this committee; I requested that I should be taken off the committee because it was too large." After conversations of the four with Mr. Howbert "a 'formal meeting' with the President was arranged. Mr. Howbert had said for the Trustees that any committee acceptable to President Slocum would be acceptable to them. Parsons, Hills, Schneider and I met the President at his office. We repeated our objections to the committee of five. He expressed his willingness to follow our wishes on the personnel of the committee and asked what committee we desired. He said that the arrangement could be made at a special meeting, soon to be held, of himself with the executive committee of the Trustees. . . . Immediately after this interview with him we had a conference and decided to recommend the three academic deans, Parsons, Cajori, and Persons, as the executive committee. . . . That some of the trustees were aware of this new arrangement in regard to the committee is shown by the fact that, soon after, Mr. Howbert asked me to come to his house for a conference at which the work of the committee of three was discussed."‡

"We then," says Dean Parsons, "separated for the summer, believing that everything was settled. . . . I returned about the middle of August to find the atmosphere charged with rumors

*Letter of G. M. Howe to Mr. Fred Caldwell.

†Memorandum of E. C. Hills, June 16, 1916.

‡Deposition of F. Cajori, corroborated by testimony of Messrs. Parsons, Hills, and Schneider.

as to work that had been going on during the summer to discredit us and alter what had been determined upon. On Monday, August 14, 1916, Mr. Philip B. Stewart, who, by the way, had not been at the annual meeting of the Trustees, called at my office, and after a few minutes of general conversation, said brusquely that the Trustees resented the faculty's criticism of their committee; therefore they had decided to abolish it altogether and would leave the authority of the College wholly in the hands of President Slocum until his successor could be appointed, and that would probably not be for a considerable period, as it would take time to get the right man. I asked him if he did not think that was a dangerous arrangement in view of the feeling in the community. He said the Trustees were willing to take the risk, and they expected the faculty to be loyal in the difficult situation." This account of Dean Parsons agrees with the contemporary memorandum of Professor Hills, to whom he reported the incident on the following day. Its accuracy is also admitted by Mr. Stewart at the meeting of Trustees and faculty on August 28. "At that meeting," states Dean Cajori, "Mr. Stewart did not impugn the accuracy of the statement of the interview . . . as given in the letter the faculty had sent to the Trustees. In fact, at that very meeting, a faculty member asked Mr. Stewart whether that statement was correct, and Mr. Stewart replied that it was correct."*

At the time of this interview between Mr. Stewart and Mr. Parsons, Professor Schneider was in the hospital with typhoid fever. Professor Hills and Dean Cajori returned to Colorado Springs on the two following days, and on being informed of what had occurred, the three agreed that it was now their duty to inform other members of the faculty of the charges against President Slocum and of the position taken by the Trustees. Their reason for this is stated by Dean Cajori as follows: "We looked upon this action of the Trustees as an outright violation of promises made to us in June, moreover we feared that this action was a scheme permitting the President to continue in office indefinitely. Consequently, we decided that our next step must be to put the information we had concerning him in the hands of all of the faculty within reach. Up to this time (from November, 1915, to August, 1916), the four faculty

*Letter of F. Cajori to Mr. Fred Caldwell.

members had concealed the charges against President Slocum even from their most intimate friends on the faculty."*

As a result of this decision, some nine other members of the faculty, who were at the time in or near Colorado Springs, were informed of the charges. At the request of Professor Howe and Professor Woodbridge, a conference of the men informed was called, which met at the house of Dean Parsons on Friday, August 18. The men present agreed, after prolonged consultation, that the letter already quoted in the introductory statement of admitted facts should be sent to all members of the Board of Trustees, accompanied by the charges made against President Slocum. "This statement," says Dean Cajori, "was sent to *all* the trustees, because the action taken hitherto had apparently been confined to a small group of local trustees, and we felt that if all the trustees knew the facts they would not consent to having President Slocum remain." This letter was signed by twelve members of the faculty, including the three academic deans, and the heads of all of the more important academic departments except biology, the lack of a signature for the latter being due to the illness of Professor Schneider.†

In consequence of this communication, Mr. Stewart called a joint meeting of Trustees and faculty members for the evening of Monday, August 28.

In considering the events of the previous two weeks, it should be pointed out that Mr. Parsons' conception of the full import of the statement of Mr. Stewart on August 14 was of course determined by his belief that efforts had been made "to discredit us and alter what had been determined upon." This belief was shared by his colleagues, and there is considerable evidence to show that since the beginning of the year the attitude of the two trustees in Colorado Springs who had been informed of the charges, as well as that of President Slocum himself, had become one of settled hostility to Professor Parsons personally, and to any plan involving the resignation of control within the College by the President. Dean Cajori states: "In the spring of 1916 and during the year 1916-17, President Slocum and others endeavored to induce me to take sides against Dean Parsons. Had I not known Dean Parsons, his character and his work, from my personal observation and experience

*Deposition of F. Cajori.

†Condensed from the testimony of Messrs. Howe, Woodbridge, Parsons, Cajori, and Ormes.

extending over twenty-five years of association with him, I should probably have yielded to this pressure."*

"During the early part of August, 1916," says Professor Schneider, "President Slocum asked me to go to see Mr. Howbert, which I did. In that interview Mr. Howbert said that he had come to believe that the charges against President Slocum were misinterpretations of actions meant to be merely kindly. He added that for my future guidance he thought it best to warn me against Dean Parsons, whom he and President Slocum mistrusted."†

"On Sunday afternoon, August 27, Motten came up to Cry-stola in the college car, and took Ormes down to Colorado Springs, where Howbert had a long interview with him, telling him that the Trustees were very angry with the faculty, and that they were unanimously determined to put their plan through."‡ "One trustee said to me in an interview at one time, 'Mr. Parsons is relentless.'§

Your committee has examined five separate accounts of the joint meeting of August 28, 1916, including one given in a letter written during the three days following the meeting. These accounts agree in all essential points. The extracts and summary following will indicate the nature of the proceedings the facts brought out by them, and the attitude of the Trustees towards Dean Parsons and his colleagues.

"The meeting was held at the residence of Mr. George A. Fowler, one of the trustees of the College, and was called by members of the Board of Trustees. There were eleven trustees present, and eleven men of the faculty. All members of the board resident in the state, who were not absent from home, and all members of the faculty who signed the general statement to the Trustees except one or two who had left for the East, were present.

"The meeting was opened by Mr. P. B. Stewart, chairman of the executive committee of the Board. Mr. Stewart berated us soundly for what we had done. . . . His main points were that we had been guilty of sending libelous matter through the mail, for which we might well be sent to the penitentiary, that we had given the slanderous charges against Dr. Slocum into the hands of

*Deposition of F. Cajori.

†Deposition of E. C. Schneider. The date must have been prior to August 14, as Mr. Schneider was then in the hospital.

‡Letter of H. E. Woodbridge to E. C. Hills, dated August 31, 1916.

§Examination of M. D. Ormes.

persons who should know nothing of them, since our letters would come into the hands of private secretaries of the men to whom they were sent, and that we had made the completion of the \$500,000 fund for the College impossible, since the Trustees, who were large contributors, would now withhold their subscriptions. His purpose was apparently to make us feel that our conduct had been thoroughly idiotic and ill-advised in every respect."*

"The speech was evidently designed to frighten and bulldoze the faculty members. . . . Stewart assured us that all the Trustees who could be reached without using the mails had been fully informed of the affair by word of mouth some time ago, and that they had acted in full knowledge of the facts. He professed throughout to be speaking for the Trustees as a body, and no one of them contradicted him. He said among other things that if every word of the charges were true, it would be as nothing compared with the wonderful services of the President. After he quit, Cajori suggested that as we had now been informed of the way the Trustees looked at the matter, it might be well if they should hear of our view, and asked that Parsons should make a statement. Parsons then presented his statement calmly and in good temper. He ended by a very strong appeal to the Trustees on the ground of the danger amounting to practical certainty that if the President continued in charge of affairs the scandal would become public. . . . The Trustees were evidently much prejudiced against him; they listened unsympathetically, and after he finished Campbell cross-questioned him, using the tactics of a criminal lawyer trying to discredit a witness."†

After this, "the trustees undertook a cross-examination of the members of the faculty. This was conducted primarily by Mr. Henry C. McAllister and Judge John Campbell. . . . Starting in with the men of the faculty across the room from him. . . . Mr. McAllister asked questions calculated to confuse and embarrass them, intermingling his questions with caustic comment. The Trustees have frequently complained during the last months that it is impossible to break through the air of distrust with which the faculty surround themselves when the two groups meet together.

*Deposition of George M. Howe. The letters of the professors had been sent by registered mail and marked personal.

†Letter of H. E. Woodbridge to E. C. Hills, dated August 31, 1916.

For my own part my disrespect and distrust of the trustees date from this meeting. We were evidently not asked to meet with them for conference, but to be browbeaten. . . . One of the faculty men took a hand in the cross-examination, and brought out the fact that the charges against Dr. Slocum had been kept within the knowledge of a very small group of the trustees. . . . When the Trustees questioned faculty members as to why they had taken the steps they did to bring the charges against Dr. Slocum to the attention of the entire board, various answers were given. The prevailing one was that this was a matter that affected the good name of Colorado College in a high degree, and that the way in which the affair had been handled by the Trustees was sure to produce a public scandal, . . . that the charges were already known to so many persons outside the faculty and trustee groups that it was impossible to keep them secret, and that influential persons had threatened to make them public if action were not taken by the Trustees. . . . It was brought out further that the men of the faculty owed special obligations to the families of the young people coming to Colorado College, and that to have ignored these charges would have rightly made them objects of public censure.”*

“Cajori made a strong appeal for a return to the plan of last June. Later this was again advocated vigorously by Parish. On Campbell’s suggestion that Parish was attempting to dictate to the Trustees, Parish retorted that Campbell was treating him unfairly by twisting out of his words something which was not fairly to be inferred from them.” Later, “it being now about 1.30 a. m., Cajori again appealed for some action, urging a return to the former plan. . . . Shortly before this Howbert had made a short appeal for the Trustees’ plan of keeping the President in control.”†

“When it seemed as though the meeting were about to adjourn with nothing accomplished,” says Dean Cajori, “I arose and said that whatever were the differences of opinion, we all had a common aim, the good of the College, and we ought not to adjourn without having made some plan of administration for the next year. As a result of this suggestion, the Trustees met by themselves, while the faculty waited in an adjoining room. Mr. Stewart then called me in and offered me the acting presidency of the College. I replied

*Deposition of G. M. Howe.

†Letter of H. E. Woodbridge.

that I must decline. . . . The Trustees then asked me what they could do and I suggested that they permit the faculty to nominate four or five men as possible members of an administrative committee from which list the Trustees could elect three men. The Trustees finally agreed to this plan, asking the faculty to nominate six from whom the Trustees could elect three men. I returned to the faculty group and secured their consent to this plan. I told the faculty that it was quite evident that Dean Parsons would not be acceptable to the Trustees as a member of this committee; Parsons stated that he would not permit his name to be voted on by the faculty as a nominee. We then adjourned.”*

With these accounts may be compared a briefer one by Professor Parish, in part as follows: “It was agreed by the faculty group at a meeting preceding that with the Trustees that Dean Parsons should present the case, and we all went over together the main points of the presentation. At the meeting with the Trustees the facts were stated by Dean Parsons, after which each member of the faculty present was called up and cross-examined by an attorney member of the Board. The process was not entirely pleasant, but it gave an opportunity to state feelings of the faculty and to urge that the Trustees go back to the agreement made originally by three of their members and assented to by President Slocum, that he withdraw on the plea of ill health (which was justified), canvass the East for funds to complete the endowment, while the administration be carried on by a faculty committee until a new President be chosen. This the Trustees were extremely reluctant to accept. They exhibited great irritation at interference on the part of the faculty, and especially showed their animosity toward Dean Parsons who was the natural spokesman for our group.”†

Mr. Henry McAllister, a member of the Board of Trustees who was present at this meeting, in reply to an inquiry from the chairman of your committee, stated that it “seemed to (him), from the conferences with members of the faculty at the meeting above referred to, . . . that Dean Parsons was the head and front of the attack upon Dr. Slocum.”‡

“The general impression,” says Professor Woodbridge, “which I

*Deposition of F. Cajori.

†Statement of John C. Parish.

‡Letter of Henry McAllister, Jr., to E. H. Hollands, February 2, 1918.

(and others) received from the meeting was that Stewart, Howbert, Campbell, and McAllister hoped to intimidate the faculty and show them up as a set of fools led astray by Parsons and Miss —.”*

That President Slocum had singled out Dean Parsons, among the signers of the letter to the Trustees, as the object of strong personal resentment, was made evident by an incident which occurred shortly after this meeting, which is reported as follows by a member of the faculty who was present: “President Slocum invited four of those professors who had signed, . . . to hear the defence which he wished to make. . . . The meeting was called at the house of Mr. Irving Howbert, . . . and there were present . . . President Slocum, Messrs. Howbert and Vance, Trustees, Mr. Postlethwaite, College Treasurer, Professor Motten, Secretary of the College, and Professors Cajori, Parish, Breitwieser, and Strieby. Before beginning his defence . . . President Slocum sought to exact a promise that each one present would not reveal or repeat any portion of what he was about to say. Professor Parish objected to making this promise, and offered to leave the room, and I also refused to make this promise of secrecy. Mr. Howbert finally persuaded President Slocum to go on with his defence without this promise of secrecy. . . . He contended that the charges against him were the result of personal ambition to supplant him, or to personal grudge or spite due to his refusal to do certain favors. He was excessively bitter against Professor Parsons, who he said had lied about him, injured him in every underhanded way for many years, trying to supplant him. His attack was so abusive and rancorous, so utterly unjust, that we four could hardly sit still and hear it. He referred to the matter of the building stone for Palmer Hall, and laid the whole blame for the loss to the College upon Professor Parsons. . . . He accused Professor Parsons of maliciously instigating charges against him of the misuse of College endowment funds.”

This account is confirmed by Professor Breitwieser and Professor Parish.

“He condemned Dean Parsons very bitterly, claiming that in various ways Dean Parsons had been trying to undermine him.”†

“He claimed that the whole thing was a frame-up under the guidance of Dean Parsons, and most of his time was spent in telling of his past relations with Dean Parsons, who, he said, had persecuted and lied about him for years in an effort to

*Letter of H. E. Woodbridge to E. C. Hills.

†Deposition of J. V. Breitwieser, Professor of Psychology.

supplant him in the presidency. He showed intense bitterness toward Dean Parsons."*

"That this intensity of feeling was shared by certain members of the Board of Trustees was made clear at the first meeting between the faculty executive committee and the corresponding Trustees committee," consisting of Messrs. Howbert, Stewart, and Armstrong, "at which time a reference to Dean Parsons brought out very heated and caustic remarks; and throughout the year there were frequent indications and expression of this feeling."[†]

The reluctance of the President and of certain of the Trustees, notably Messrs. Stewart and Howbert, to transfer the control of the internal affairs of the College to this faculty executive committee continued to be shown in various ways during the months which followed. In fact, this control was at no time wholly in their hands. As has been noticed before, no public announcement of the withdrawal of the President from the administration of affairs within the College, or of his approaching retirement, was made until after the joint meeting of August 28. The three members of the faculty executive committee make the following statements in regard to the relations of this committee to the President and to the executive committee of the Trustees:

"About the time of the College opening the faculty nominated six men; the Trustees selected out of that number, as the faculty executive committee, John C. Parish, Edward C. Schneider, and myself, making me chairman. The College opened with President Slocum in charge as usual. Before he left for the East to raise money for the endowment fund he and Mr. Howbert called me into the President's office for a conference, and Mr. Howbert said in the presence of President Slocum and myself that the internal administration was now in the hands of the faculty executive committee and that that committee would remain in charge until a new President was ready to take up the work. Mr. Slocum then said something about his desire to retain membership on some of the faculty committees. . . . When I mentioned this matter to Professors Parsons and Schneider, they seriously objected to this arrangement; I myself felt that it would be better for the President not to retain any membership on committees and in private conference with him I was able to secure his consent to the removal of his name. At about this time President Slocum showed me a

*Deposition of John C. Parish.

[†]*Ibid.* Mr. Parish was a member of the faculty executive committee.

typewritten outline directing how the executive work of the College should be carried on; the document was not signed by any one. One of the items was that the Dean of Women, the Treasurer of the College, and the Secretary of the College, should not be interfered with in their work. My own personal duties, those of the Dean of Women, and those of the Secretary, were outlined; the faculty executive committee was ignored in the document. I told the president that this did not meet the agreement with the faculty, and that its executive committee must be given the place agreed upon. I also told him that the statement about non-interference had better be omitted, as it would tend to cause friction by its implications. On my insistence, the paper was revised in accordance with my suggestions. President Slocum left for the East about the middle of October, and the executive committee of three assumed charge as agreed. There was some friction during the year between the committee and the business office of the College; but the committee was agreed within itself. . . . I consider that this was the most harmonious year, within the faculty, and between the faculty and the students, which the College had ever had. President Slocum returned from the East in the spring of 1917 to carry on his campaign for money at home. The question then came up as to what his relation to the College should be. He himself felt that he should have freedom to participate in the religious exercises of the College; the faculty as a whole was very much opposed to this. Through my mediation he was permitted to take a restricted part in some of the services. Then the question of commencement came up. The Trustees, both in the East and in the West, requested that President Slocum should be given full powers at commencement time. The faculty objected, particularly in regard to his delivering the baccalaureate sermon. The final adjustment reached was that Mr. Slocum should have full authority at the commencement exercises, but that the faculty would not be required or expected to attend the baccalaureate sermon. Some time before commencement the faculty had carefully considered the matter of honorary degrees, and had recommended to the Trustees that such a degree should be conferred upon Miss Ruth Loomis, in recognition of her twenty years of useful service to the College as Dean of Women, which were to end at this time. Later it became known that the Trustees were planning to confer other honorary

degrees. I made objections to that procedure to Mr. Howbert, on the ground that initiative in matters of this sort had always in past years come from the faculty and the President acting together. The faculty executive committee finally yielded when Mr. Howbert informed us for the Trustees that the constitution and by-laws of the College gave the Trustees power to vote such degrees, even without recommendation from the President. Four additional degrees were conferred, one upon President Slocum himself.”*

Professor Schneider states: “The faculty executive committee was appointed while I was ill with typhoid fever, and it began its work before I had recovered sufficiently to participate in the work. When I first learned of conditions I found that President Slocum and Mr. Howbert had divided up the President’s work, and assigned parts to Treasurer Postlethwaite, Secretary Motten, and Dean Loomis, and had informed each that they were to work independently from, and not be responsible to, the executive committee. This division of labor remained in effect throughout the year in spite of our protest. Many events showed clearly the Trustees’ attitude towards the committee. It was their will that all mails should first pass through the hands of the Treasurer or Secretary. The Dean of Women resigned and her successor was being sought without the faculty executive committee having knowledge of it. Two of the three members of the Trustees’ Executive Committee were away from the city for much of the winter, and no substitutes were appointed. . . . The financial records were closed to us, and when it became necessary to fill a vacancy we were told what the salary was for the position, but were refused further information which pertained to the faculty salary list. These are only some of the things which show that the Trustees did not support the faculty executive committee.”†

The account of Mr. Parish is briefer, but to the same effect. “Before the President left town in the fall, he made every effort to dictate and limit the powers of the faculty executive committee. The committee of the Board of Trustees was in constant touch with him, and the periods of his returns to Colorado Springs were times of great difficulty for the executive committee because of the concessions we were asked to make in the interests of peace. These concessions we almost invariably did make, and included the turn-

*Deposition of F. Cajori.

†Deposition of E. C. Schneider.

ing over chapel and Sunday vesper services to him at one time and another, and also the exercises of commencement time.”*

All three members of the faculty committee testify that Dean Parsons in no way attempted to control their decisions or work. Dean Cajori says, “He held himself in the background during the entire year”; Professor Schneider, “I know that he was not stirring up trouble during these months”; Professor Parish, “During the year Dean Parsons carefully refrained from taking an active part in the conduct of affairs, and made no effort to influence the actions or decisions of the executive committee.”

Dean Parsons was dismissed on July 9. On July 11 the Pike’s Peak Chapter of the Alumni of Colorado College sent to him and to Professor Albright letters stating the confidence of the alumni in their constant loyalty to Colorado College. Copies of these letters were sent to the Trustees and the following reply was received from one of them:

“July 16, 1917.

“*LILLIAN JOHNSON, Acting Secretary, etc.;*

“*Dear Madam;* I acknowledge receipt of yours July 14 enclosing copies of letters sent out by your Association, and have no comment to make other than that the spreading of scandal about one who is no longer connected with the College, to the unquestioned detriment of that College, is not my idea of loyalty.

“Very truly,
“M. D. THATCHER.”

On July 16 Mr. R. H. Arnold, an alumnus of the College, addressed a letter to Mr. Benjamin Griffith, a member of the Board of Trustees, urging that the Trustees should reconsider their action in regard to Dean Parsons. In the course of his reply, which was written on July 18, Mr. Griffith said:

“I will say further that from the knowledge of the facts which I possess, it has seemed to me that Dr. Slocum has been wronged; and feeling as I do, I am not disposed personally, to ask for Professor Parsons’ reinstatement which you suggest.”

The committee is of opinion that these statements by two trustees, written informally, immediately after the dismissal of Dean Parsons, and before the subsequent controversy had resulted in a greater reserve as to the exact grounds for that action, are of considerable significance in showing the motives for it.

*Statement of John C. Parish.

Summary of Conclusions Concerning Cause of Dismissal of Dean Parsons

(A) Your committee finds that a review of the evidence establishes the following conclusions:

First, that Dean Parsons was regarded, by the President and by the Trustees, as the leader in the action taken by his colleagues because of the charges against the President. He had been the first member of the faculty to hear those charges; because of a series of events to be discussed later, he had been the first to discuss the charges with persons outside of the faculty and the Trustees; at the request of his three colleagues, he had written to inquire regarding additional testimony said to be available in this matter,* after three of the trustees had been informed of the charges, he was the first person to be called in consultation by Mr. Stewart of the trustees;† he was the first to be informed of the changed plans of the Trustees in August, 1916; it was at his house that the conference occurred which drew up the resulting letter to members of the Board; it was also at his house that the members of the faculty conferred before going to the subsequent joint meeting; at that meeting, by request of his colleagues, he acted as their spokesman; and the Trustees treated him as their responsible leader. It should also be noticed that at the time the charges were first taken up, Mr. Parsons was Vice-President of the College as well as Dean.

Second, that the President, and members of the Board of Trustees, had become reluctant to carry out the agreement that the President should resign and that in the interim the administration should be given over to a faculty committee; and that they made repeated attempts to avoid carrying out this agreement. When Messrs. Stewart and Howbert were informed of the charges, they at first agreed that the situation made the resignation of the President necessary, and that the administration during the interim before the appointment of a new President should be in the hands of a small faculty committee. But there was a strange delay of several months before they informed President Slocum of these charges, and they eventually did so only in the face of the danger of public scandal. Arrangements were then made for his resignation, and the promise made that he would either retire altogether in June, or

*Depositions of E. C. Schneider, compared with that of E. C. Hills.

†Deposition of E. S. Parsons.

present his resignation to take effect one year later, the administration of internal affairs to be meanwhile in the hands of a faculty committee. It appears to have been shortly after this that Professor Howe was asked to prepare an announcement of the resignation for the press. There followed the informal meeting of Trustees in May, and from this time on the attitude of the President and of the two trustees appears to have changed. The trustees present at this meeting left the administration in the hands of the President, and appointed an advisory instead of an executive committee, one member of which, the Secretary of the College, was regarded by his colleagues as a confidential agent of the President. Mr. Howe was requested to defer the preparation of the announcement of resignation for the present. The four professors made a protest to Mr. Howbert, and he assured them that the original arrangement would be carried out at the meeting of the Board in June. Before this meeting the professors discovered that Dr. Slocum had been writing what they regarded as distorted versions of the affair to various people; they called upon him to protest against this action, and after a prolonged discussion of the dangers of the situation he dictated a statement of his intention to carry out the original agreement. But at the meeting in June, although it was common knowledge that the Board invariably consented to measures on which Dr. Slocum insisted, his resignation, while it was presented, was not accepted; all public announcement of it was withheld; and a faculty Executive Committee of five was appointed for the following year, two of whose members were known as the special friends of Dr. Slocum. On the protest of the four professors, Dr. Slocum agreed that these two members should be omitted from the committee. But between this time and the middle of August various efforts were made to weaken the position of the group of four professors, and Mr. Howbert associated himself with the President in calling in question the trustworthiness of Dean Parsons. Mr. Stewart's announcement of the intention of the Trustees to leave full control in the hands of the President until his successor should be appointed at some indefinite future time followed this. The Trustees as a body obviously went into their joint meeting with the faculty fully resolved that this intention should be carried out, and hoping to intimidate the faculty members into abandoning their opposition to it. Of the three trustees originally informed of the charges, Messrs. Stewart and Campbell took a leading part in this attempt at

intimidation; Mr. Howbert pleaded, at the close of the meeting, that the President should retain full control. The Trustees yielded with great reluctance to the determined attitude of the eleven professors, and returned to a somewhat altered form of the original agreement, apparently intended to exclude Dean Parsons from the executive committee. The faculty executive committee was subsequently appointed, but not until some time after the college year had begun; and its control throughout the year was seriously limited by independent powers reserved to three administrative officials of the College who were regarded as the special representatives and friends of Dr. Slocum, and by insistence that the President should on various occasions take part in chapel services, although it had been understood that he would have nothing to do with the inner life of the College.

What the occasion was of the change of attitude on the part of Messrs. Stewart and Howbert, towards the situation presented by the charges against President Slocum, and the danger that they would become public, remains a matter of surmise. If some new and essential facts had become known to them, which made the course of action which they had at first declared proper and expedient become unnecessary or unjustified, it does not appear that they ever disclosed them to members of the faculty. This lack of frankness and straightforwardness, in circumstances which especially called for these qualities, and the callous disregard for the fact that members of the faculty had a special responsibility, more immediate than that of the Trustees, for the honor of the College and the welfare of its students, appears to your committee to deserve severe censure.

Third, that the part taken by Dean Parsons in the series of events which brought about the resignation of President Slocum was especially and bitterly resented. This resentment was manifested in the attitude of trustees towards him at the joint meeting. It appeared in the attack upon him personally by the President which took place shortly after, and also in the remarks of trustees on various occasions, during the following months. It is disclosed in the letters of Messrs. Thatcher and Griffith, written immediately after his dismissal.

In the light of the conclusions just rehearsed, your committee finds that it is morally certain, declarations of the Trustees to the contrary notwithstanding, that the real cause for the decision of the

Trustees to dismiss Dean Parsons was resentment for the part which he had taken in bringing about the resignation of President Slocum, and in insisting that the arrangements made for his resignation should include immediate and effectual surrender of all control of the internal affairs of Colorado College.

(B) The committee has next to consider the second of the two questions stated at the beginning of this section of the report, viz., Was Dean Parsons justified in insisting that President Slocum should resign?

The following are the only passages from testimony which it seems necessary to cite under this head:

"Up to this time (from November, 1915, to August, 1916) the four faculty members (Parsons, Hills, Cajori, and Schneider) had concealed the charges against President Slocum even from their most intimate friends on the faculty. No important step had been taken by anyone of us in the matter except after discussion and agreement of all four; if our action was in any way disloyal to the College or unjust to the President, we were, all four of us, *equally* involved. I wish to emphasize this particularly."*

"These men worked together from December, 1915, to August, 1916, and have equally shared in the initiative which led to the knowledge of the case being brought to three of the trustees. In all that we have done, each is equally responsible."†

"No steps were taken by any of us without the request or permission of the other members of the group of four. Mr. Parsons wrote . . . letters because we requested him to do so."‡

"We four men felt that action must be taken. At no time did we desire to harm anyone. In fact, we sought to shield both individuals and the College. Dr. Parsons was quite insistent that nothing be done to harm the persons chiefly concerned. . . . Perhaps we blundered at times, but in the main our intentions were thoroughly good."§

The testimony in regard to the consultations of the larger group of professors, before sending their letter to the Trustees, in August, 1918, has already been cited.

In its examination of this part of the controversy, your committee

*Deposition of F. Cajori.

†Letter of Messrs. Cajori and Schneider to Mr. Howbert, July 17, 1917.

‡Letter of E. C. Schneider to F. Caldwell.

§Letter of E. C. Hills to F. Caldwell.

has not considered that it has been assigned the duty of passing judgment upon the charges which were made against President Slocum. It consequently has not examined the evidence with a view to the determination of the truth or falsity of these charges; and it, therefore, expressly declines to pronounce any opinion upon the charges as such. The committee desires that readers of this report shall clearly understand that, in view of this limitation of the scope of the inquiry, nothing that is said in the report is intended to carry, or can legitimately carry, any implication whatever respecting the merits of the charges. It has, however, seemed to this committee necessary to examine such testimony on this subject as was actually before those members of the College faculty who were informed up to August 28, 1916, together with some collateral evidence—most of it available at that time—which throws light upon the character of this original testimony. This material, however, the committee has examined only in so far as it bears upon the question of the occasion and motives of the action of Dean Parsons and his associates, and upon the propriety of the position taken by them in the then existing circumstances.

As a result of its examination of this material, together with the testimony which has been included in the preceding pages, your committee believes that the two deans and their colleagues were sincerely convinced that the charges—to which it had been threatened that general publicity would be given—created a situation which made it not to the best interest of the College that the President should continue to administer its internal affairs; and that their subsequent action, upon these premises, was dictated by an earnest desire for the good of the College. The testimony at that time offered to the faculty group and the other persons who were made acquainted with the affair was not, in the committee's opinion, subjected to so thorough and searching a testing as was desirable, in so grave a matter. But, as has been said, the question pertinent to this report concerns the situation as it presented itself in 1916 to the deans and professors acquainted with the evidence at that time. The committee considers that, given the character of the formal statements then before these members of the faculty, the position taken by them was a natural one, in view of all the circumstances, including the importance of preventing a harmful public scandal.

It is, moreover, to be borne in mind that Dean Parsons acted throughout, in this matter, as a member of a group of four of the

most highly esteemed members of the faculty—consisting, in addition to himself, of Dr. Florian Cajori, Professor of Mathematics, and Dean of the Department of Engineering, Dr. E. C. Schneider, Professor of Biology, and Dr. E. C. Hills, Professor of Romance Languages. The evidence, and the circumstances of the situation, were considered by this group in numerous and prolonged conferences, and no step was taken except by their unanimous vote. For all decisions reached all were equally and jointly responsible. It is also to be observed that their view that the interests of the college required the retirement of the President was fully shared in the spring of 1916 by at least two of the three trustees who were then cognizant of the matter; and that, though these gentlemen subsequently altered their opinion, it does not appear that they informed the four professors of this change, or of the reasons for it. The ten additional members of the faculty who were called into consultation in August, 1916, came to the same conclusion as the four originally informed. These circumstances are mentioned by the committee, not as having any evidential significance whatever, with respect to the charges against the President, but solely as indicating that the attitude assumed by Dean Parsons was not a singularity of his own, but was then common to him and others, including nearly all of his colleagues who had been consulted in this matter.

After weighing the considerations rehearsed, the committee finds that the action of Dean Parsons in urging the resignation of the President was in accordance with a proper sense of what his duty, as an official and professor of the College, was, under the circumstances so far as they were known to him; that he took no steps to bring about the President's withdrawal until after he had made some inquiry into the original charges, though he did not adequately test the testimony at every point; that his omission to do this may be reasonably excused by the apparent need for immediate action, and by other reasons which need not here be entered upon, among them the fact that persons outside of the college community were informed of the charges before he was himself; that Dr. Slocum himself had, in the spring of 1916, accepted the view that his resignation was desirable; and that, therefore, the Trustees of Colorado College had no reasonable grounds for resenting the action of Dean Parsons in insisting that President Slocum should resign.

This finding of the committee applies also to the action taken

jointly with Dean Parsons by three other professors prior to and until August 14, 1916, and to the action on that date by the larger group of faculty members, in sending a communication to individual members of the Board of Trustees; the committee judging that, although this action of the larger group would have been normally ill-advised, and was in a measure contrary to the intention of the original group of four to prevent further spread of information concerning the charges, it was at that time justified by the reasonable belief that many trustees, while in ignorance concerning the exact situation, were consenting to a course of action regarded by these professors as highly dangerous to the interests of the College, for the protection of which they themselves were immediately responsible.

In addition, the committee finds that members of the Board of trustees are themselves responsible for the wide and unpleasant publicity that has been given to this feature of the case. Instead of taking counsel with those members of the faculty who were informed of the situation, and fully revealing to them their judgment as to how it could best be met, and their reasons for that judgment, they failed at critical moments to recognize the independent responsibility for informed judgment belonging to members of the faculty, or to acknowledge their sincerity and sense of duty by frank and honorable discussion. This arbitrary and unjust attitude of the Trustees, with its lack of that considerate respect for the convictions of others which characterizes men of sensitive conscience, was apparent in the joint meeting of August, 1916; it was still more gravely shown in the arbitrary dismissal of Dean Parsons; and it has been manifested repeatedly in the persistent refusal of the Trustees to make specific and official statement of their grounds for that dismissal. The Trustees, as a body, do not seem to have considered that they have, towards the academic profession or towards the public at large, any responsibility to account for their acts and decisions as Trustees. They refused opportunity of defence to the persons whom their action injured. They behaved as though legal power were equivalent to moral right. They have done grievous harm to the institution entrusted to them; and the only means of reparation now in their power is to make full and honorable amends.

III. VARIOUS CHARGES OF TRUSTEES AGAINST DEAN PARSONS

The third main question before the committee is: Was there any just ground for the dismissal of Dean Parsons?

The following is a résumé of the complaints made by trustees against Dean Parsons, so far as your committee has been able to learn anything definite about them.

At the July, 1917, meeting of the special executive committee of the trustees with the faculty, Dean Cajori stated three charges which he had understood from trustees were made against Dean Parsons. These charges all referred to unwarranted publishing of the charges against President Slocum. The trustees then present declared that Mr. Cajori's statement of these complaints was inaccurate, but they refused to amend it, or to discuss the matter. Mr. Parsons' action in referring rumors of "financial irregularities" to the college attorney in 1911, instead of taking them to the Trustees directly, was mentioned, and admitted by the Trustees as one of their complaints in regard to him; but at the same time it was declared that this was not the real occasion for requesting his resignation.*

On August 14, Mr. Fred Caldwell, as chairman of a group of alumni petitioners, addressed a letter to the secretary of the Board of Trustees, asking that these alumni might have a hearing by the Board in regard to the dismissal of Dean Parsons. In concluding this letter, he wrote:

"We are advised only indirectly as to the specific grounds upon which the Board of Trustees based their action against Dean Parsons, and if they should wish to furnish us with a specification of their charges before the hearing we would be glad to receive the same."

The board set a hearing of this committee for August 24; but it did not furnish any statement of its charges.

At this hearing, "the alumni petitioners were represented by a committee of some twelve or fifteen members. We stated to the trustees, that not having been furnished with a specification of the charges against Dean Parsons, we had necessarily been compelled to prepare ourselves to answer such general charges as we understood they entertained against him, and which had come to us through indirect sources. In general the charges were in substance as follows: (1) that Dean Parsons had been guilty of disloyal conduct toward the College and the Board of Trustees; (2) that he had committed acts of insubordination; (3) that because of his personal animus toward President Slocum, he had exaggerated the charges against President Slocum and had been extremely narrow and unfair in his entire treatment of the Slocum matter; (4) that, in fact, if it had not been for Dean Parsons' personal animosity and his influence over other members

* Deposition of H. E. Woodbridge. Mr. Woodbridge's account was written on the day of the meeting.

of the faculty, President Slocum's usefulness to the College would not have been destroyed and the College would have been spared that humiliation and disgrace; (5) that Parsons had at one time undertaken to obtain through the public press an exposure of the entire Slocum matter with no other purpose in mind than to satisfy his personal animosity; (6) that some six or seven years prior to his dismissal, by the Board of Trustees, Parsons had brought discredit upon the financial administration of the College by statements which he had made more or less publicly and which charged the misappropriation of the college funds.

These general charges we undertook to answer by presenting to the Board of Trustees written statements from other members of the faculty. . . . When we had finished our presentation of the matter in chief, we invited questions for discussion from the members of the Board present, and in response, Judge Campbell made the general statement in which he said, addressing me personally, and referring to the written statements which we had presented, "Mr. Caldwell, those statements do not cover the charges which we have against Mr. Parsons. We did not dismiss him upon those grounds." I asked Judge Campbell then to please state to us the grounds upon which they did act in dismissing Dean Parsons. . . . Considerable discussion was had back and forth between myself, speaking for our committee, and Judge Campbell, but at no time did any other member of the Board present state upon what grounds they did act in dismissing Dean Parsons, if other than those covered by the written statements which we had presented. When pressed by me, Judge Campbell, in a general way, stated that they could not reveal to us their charges against Dean Parsons or the grounds upon which they had acted."

In consequence of this statement of Judge Campbell denying that the charges upon which the alumni committee had presented a defence were the grounds of the dismissal, on August 27 Mr. Caldwell sent a letter to the Board of Trustees, in which he said:

"If the statement made by the member of your Board on the 24th instant is correct, then we most respectfully urge upon you the desirability and necessity of complying with our previous request of the 14th instant for a specification of your charges in order that we may meet the same at such future hearing as you may arrange. We are also pleased to advise that Mr. Parsons will, in the interest of our petition, gladly meet with you at any time and place you may designate, for the purpose of affording you an opportunity of questioning him in the presence of the representatives of our committee."

Mr. Caldwell adds: "We received no answer to this second request for specification of the Board's charges against Dean Parsons."*

Mr. R. H. Arnold, another alumnus present at this meeting, gives substantially the same account in less detail:

"After the alumni had presented their case, Judge Campbell of the Trustees said that the Trustees would practically concede all the evidence that the alumni had presented concerning the Slocum case and the statements of fact made in

* Deposition of Mr. Fred Caldwell.

letters from faculty members as to Mr. Parsons' loyalty in acting in regard to it as he did; but that the real cause of Mr. Parsons' dismissal was of much earlier date. On being pressed by Mr. Caldwell to state this real cause, he said that he wished to know whether the alumni present represented Professor Parsons. The answer was no, that we represented only the alumni. This question and answer was repeated several times, but no definite statement of the other charges alleged against Professor Parsons was made."*

Professor L. R. Ingersoll, of the University of Wisconsin, also an alumnus present at this time, says: "All our conversations held with individual trustees or with the Board as a whole were unsatisfactory, in that they consistently refused to allege specific grounds in justification of their dismissal of Dean Parsons other than the frequently reiterated proposition that it was their right to dismiss any one whose presence they believed to be inimical to the best interests of the institution. (At the August meeting) the whole matter was gone over thoroughly and a most painstaking attempt made on the part of the alumni to secure from the Trustees a definite statement as to their grounds for the dismissal of Dean Parsons. This they resolutely refused to make as a body."†

At the time when the request for an investigation in Colorado College was under consideration by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, its chairman, Professor A. A. Young, on July 19, 1917, addressed a letter to President Slocum, inquiring concerning the circumstances. President Slocum referred him to Mr. P. B. Stewart, as chairman of the executive committee of the Board of Trustees. Mr. Stewart's reply to a request then sent to him for a statement giving the reasons for the dismissal was short and uncertain, and did not include such a statement.

Immediately after the organization of this sub-committee of inquiry, at the end of November, its chairman went to Colorado Springs. On the evening of November 30 he called on President C. A. Duniway, and requested him to arrange interviews with such members of the Board of Trustees as were at that time in the city, either in a group or individually. On calling on the President again at the time set on the following morning, he was informed that no arrangements for the requested interviews had been made.

Between the date of this visit and the end of December, a letter was sent to each member of the Board of Trustees, requesting in

* Statement of R. H. Arnold, dictated to E. H. Hollands, December 2, 1917.

† Deposition of L. R. Ingersoll.

each case (1) his reasons for voting affirmatively in the question of the dismissal of Dean Parsons; (2) any relevant facts or evidence which he believed should be before the committee, or suggestions regarding possible sources of pertinent evidence; (3) any suggestion in regard to the conduct of the investigation which he wished to add. In replies to this letter, no statements of any kind were made, except in the one instance of the brief sentence heretofore quoted from a letter of Mr. Henry McAllister, Jr. The trustees declined to make individual answer, and said that their procedure as a body, in respect to the proposed investigation, would be determined at a meeting of the Board, to take place January 17, 1918.

On January 12th, the chairman wrote again to Mr. Stewart and to President Duniway, suggesting that if it would remove possible difficulties, he would arrange to visit Colorado Springs again, accompanied by another member of this committee, in order to confer with the Trustees and secure their statements. Immediately after the Board meeting he received the following reply from President Duniway:

“PRESIDENT'S OFFICE, COLORADO COLLEGE,
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.
January 19, 1918.

“PROFESSOR EDMUND H. HOLLANDS:

“*My dear Professor Hollands;* I am in receipt of your letter of January 12. While it is not clear in what way the visit which you suggest for a conference with our Trustees will be of material assistance to the College, I do not doubt that a request for a conference will receive an affirmative reply from the Board of Trustees, or at least from such of them as may be able to attend a meeting. If you will give me a few days advance notice when you request such a conference I will undertake to notify members of the Board immediately.

“Lacking accurate information on the method and scope of the work which the committee of which you are chairman is undertaking to do, members of the Board of Trustees feel that they are not prepared to do more at this time than to express their willingness to meet you and members of your committee in conference on your request.

“Very truly,
“C. A. DUNIWAY,
“President.”

In consequence of this statement that the Trustees lacked accurate information, on January 26 the chairman sent a letter to President Duniway, in which the occasion, method, and scope of the investigation by this Association were set forth at some length. In opening this letter, he stated that he would arrange a second

visit, by two members of this committee, for the purpose of a conference with the Trustees, and said:

"I am doing this, of course, on the assumption that the Trustees will be willing to state to us in conference their grounds for the dismissal of Professor Parsons. Am I right in assuming that this is the case? Please let me know definitely in regard to this, as the principal object of such a conference would be to secure this statement in the direct and frank way which conversation permits. The committee wishes to know the Trustees' side of the case as fully as the other, and I believe that this is the best way to get it. I would arrange to have a stenographer present, and would furnish you at once with a copy of the record."*

A copy of this letter was sent to each member of the Board of Trustees. President Duniway replied as follows:

"February 1, 1918.

"My dear Professor Hollands;

"Your letter of January 26 was duly received. Inasmuch as you state that you were mailing copies of the letter to members of the Board of Trustees I think it best to delay answering its main question until after they have an opportunity to receive and consider what you have written. While I do not doubt that the Trustees will be willing to meet you and Professor Lowes, complying with your request for a conference, for the sake of frankness which conversation permits, it is not yet clear to what extent they would like to have the proceedings of such a meeting become a formal record.

"Very truly,

"C. A. Duniway,
"President."

No further answer to the question in regard to the willingness of the Trustees having been received, Chairman Young of the General Committee nevertheless advised that the second visit to Colorado Springs be arranged, in order that every opportunity might be afforded to the Trustees to present their side of the case. Accordingly, on February 18 the chairman of this committee informed President Duniway that, together with Professor Lefevre, he would arrive in Colorado Springs on Friday, March 1, and asked that a conference be arranged as soon as possible thereafter, "in order that we may have opportunity to meet persons whose testimony they may wish us to secure."

The conference thus requested took place on the evening of

* Extract from letter of E. H. Hollands to President C. A. Duniway, January 26, 1918.

March 1, in one of the college buildings, and lasted about two hours, being brought to a close by the announcement that the usual time for shutting off the electric lighting current of the College had arrived. There were present, of the Board of Trustees, Messrs. Stewart, Howbert, Lennox, Shove, Shoup, and President Duniway; on the part of this committee, Professors Lefevre and Hollands. Your representatives had a stenographer in attendance, but the Trustees declined to allow her to be present. The greater part of the time was occupied by a long statement by Mr. Stewart of the Trustees' complaints in regard to Dean Parsons; there were also brief remarks by Messrs. Howbert and Shove. No witnesses were named whom the committee should examine, and no sources of evidence were suggested. As the meeting broke up, Professor Hollands pointed out to President Duniway that the Trustees had not presented their case in a way that made it susceptible of formal investigation, and President Duniway stated in reply that the reason for this was that the Trustees did not recognise the jurisdiction of this committee in the matter.

After returning home, Professor Hollands drew up from memory a statement of the remarks of Mr. Stewart, had it verified by Professor Lefevre, and sent it to President Duniway, together with the following letter:

"March 10, 1918.

"**PRESIDENT C. A. DUNIWAY,**
Colorado College.

"*My dear President Duniway:* Enclosed please find a statement of the grounds for the dismissal of Dean Parsons, as stated by Mr. Stewart on the evening of March first. . . . Will you kindly read it through yourself, and have Mr. Stewart do so, and then return it to me with his confirmation and yours, or with such corrections and additions as seem necessary to you?

"This letter and enclosure will be sent to you by Professor Lefevre, as I am sending the statement to him in order to be sure that his memory agrees with mine in the matter.

"I take this opportunity to renew the request that the Board should now, in addition to this informal statement, supply the committee with an official summary of its grounds for the dismissal of Dean Parsons.

"Sincerely yours,

"EDMUND H. HOLLANDS, *Chairman.*"

Replies to these requests were received as follows:

"COLORADO SPRINGS,
April 4, 1918.

"MR. EDMUND H. HOLLANDS:

"*My dear Sir;* Dr. Duniway and I have been alternatively absent from Colorado Springs, and only in the last few days have we been able to take up your letter with enclosed memorandum of my statements of the Trustees' case at the informal meeting which we had with you and Mr. Lefevre.

"The Trustees are about to make a statement of their view of recent events in the College, and should you care for it I presume a copy will be available for you. This statement is the only one for which the Trustees can be held responsible.

"I am,
"Very truly yours,
"PHILIP B. STEWART."

"PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
April 4, 1918.

"PROFESSOR E. H. HOLLANDS:

"*My dear Professor Hollands;* I regret that an answer to your letter of March 10 has been so long delayed. Both Mr. Stewart and I have been out of the city at different times, making conferences difficult.

"I understand that Mr. Stewart will write on his own behalf. It only seems necessary for me to say that the informal conference held between members of the Board and Professor Lefevre and yourself, continues to be regarded by us in that light. We stipulated that we would confine our efforts to giving your committee the benefit of informal conversation merely. It would not be consistent for me to comply with your request by attempting to revise and certify to the correctness of your report of informal conversations.

"I shall soon be able to let you have a copy of a brief statement which the Board of Trustees are sending to the Alumni of Colorado College.

"Yours truly,
"C. A. DUNIWAY,
"President."

In accordance with the concluding paragraphs of these letters, on April 8 President Duniway forwarded two copies of a printed circular letter from the Trustees to the Alumni, dated April 5, 1918, and signed by all members of the Board of Trustees but one. This letter is added to this report as Appendix C. The statements of this circular letter, as will be seen on reading it, are so vague and general in their terms that it would not be possible to subject them to exact test or verification. In fact, the complaints in regard to the behavior of Dean Parsons and his relation to the Board of Trustees, prior to the date of his dismissal, are so stated that no one unacquainted with the history of the case could understand what acts of his are referred to.

In the light of this record of the procedures of the President and Trustees of Colorado College, in response to repeated requests for a definite statement of the charges against Dean Parsons, your committee feels that it would be fully warranted in finding that there was no just ground for the dismissal of Dean Parsons, and concluding its report at this point.

But in fairness to Dean Parsons, to his colleagues, and to the alumni of the College who joined in requesting this investigation, since various complaints in regard to his behavior have been unofficially stated by individual trustees, and have been, vaguely but officially, repeated in this letter to the alumni, the committee feels obliged to examine these complaints, in so far as they have not been covered in the preceding sections of this report. In doing this, the vague statements of the letter will be interpreted where necessary by the statements of Mr. Stewart in conference with your representatives. The committee feels warranted in doing this, since its account of these statements has been verified by the two members present at that time, and since this report of complaints agrees with the independent reports of various conversations with trustees by professors and alumni of Colorado College, in that although in these conversations individual trustees did not agree in their complaints, the complaints made by Mr. Stewart, and vaguely repeated in this letter, all appear in one or another of these independent reports.

The charges against Dean Parsons in regard to his behavior prior to his dismissal are contained in the second paragraph of the "Statement—Board of Trustees of the Colorado College to the Alumni." This paragraph reads as follows:

"In July, 1917, the Board were finally convinced that due regard for the maintenance of a unified and effective administration and a proper spirit of co-operation in the work of the College made it obligatory for them to sever the connection of Professor Parsons with the College. This final conclusion was the result of many experiences extending through a series of years and culminating in active antagonism to the Board during more than a year after the resignation of President Slocum. To put the matter in the form of a reply to assertions which have been widely circulated, the dismissal of Dean Parsons was not due to resentment against him for what he is alleged to have done in "saving the College on a moral issue despite the indifference of the Trustees." Neither was his dismissal due to resentment for his alleged "exposure of financial irregularities, which the Trustees condoned by a 'whitewashing' report." Both the alleged "moral issue" and the alleged "financial irregularities" (the latter after a full report from a certified public accountant) were fully and fairly considered by the Board when

the allegations were made. The enviable reputation of the College for its moral and religious life and its financial administration was shown to be justified. In these matters, however, as in others, Mr. Parsons has proved himself unwilling, or at least unable, to co-operate with the Trustees in a spirit of loyalty to the College. Under trying circumstances, when President Slocum was absent and untiringly at work to complete an endowment campaign, and when the Board was entitled to the active support of every member of the Faculty for the welfare of the College, Mr. Parsons opposed and endeavored to nullify the policies of the Trustees."

The first two sentences of this paragraph imply that Dean Parsons had set himself in opposition to the administrative authority of the College, and had been a source of difficulties and embarrassments, through a series of years prior to 1916. Mr. Stewart stated that during this time he seemed to resent the authority which President Slocum naturally exercised because of his strong personality and great services; that he took offence where none was offered; that he listened to gossip, and was the one man on the faculty to whom men with "complaints" and "grievances" went.

Professor M. D. Ormes, the librarian of the College, when personally examined, stated in reply to specific questioning on this matter, that he had been the colleague and intimate friend of Dean Parsons for about thirty years; that Dean Parsons, acting as Vice-President, was in the constant habit of referring matters which came up to the decision of President Slocum; that it was Mr. Ormes's impression that his co-operation with the President was entirely thorough and kindly; that he had never heard Dean Parsons say a word about the Trustees; and that he had no reason to believe that prior to the Fall of 1915, Dean Parsons had at any time sought to uncover grounds of complaint against the administration of the President, or that he had invited the confidence of those aggrieved.*

On March 18, the following questions were sent to Miss Marianna Brown, for twelve years registrar of the College:

(1) Between what dates did you serve as registrar of Colorado College? (2) Did your work bring you into fairly constant relations with Mr. Parsons as dean? (3) If so, would you describe him as a "troublemaker" in administrative affairs? (4) More particularly, was he in the habit of criticising the President and the Trustees? Of gossiping about them? Or of complaining about their acts and policies? . . . (6) Did he seem glad to listen

* Condensed from the examination of Professor Ormes by Messrs. Hollands and Lefevre, March 2, 1918.

to and encourage the complaints or stories of others concerning the President? (7) Was his attitude towards President Slocum unfriendly or hostile?

Her answers to these questions were as follows:

(1) September 1, 1905, to November 16, 1917. (2) Yes. (3) No. (4) No. No. . . . (6) No. (7) Never hostile, always respectful.

The committee considers that this testimony, given by two close associates, and confirmed by informal statements of other colleagues, sufficiently disproves the general complaint that Dean Parsons had been for many years insubordinate, a receiver of complaints, and a troublemaker.

The remaining sentences of the paragraph from the circular letter of the Trustees quoted above refer, though very vaguely, to the more specific complaints mentioned by Mr. Stewart.

The third sentence presumably refers to Mr. Parsons' share in urging the resignation of President Slocum. Its denial that he was dismissed on account of this has been discussed sufficiently in the preceding section of this report.

The fourth sentence refers to Mr. Parsons' action, in conjunction with his colleague, Professor Gile, occasioned by reports of irregularities in use of college funds, which occurred in 1911. The matter will be discussed below.

In the last two sentences of the paragraph it is stated that "in these matters, however, as in others, Mr. Parsons had proven himself unwilling, or at least unable, to co-operate with the Trustees in a spirit of loyalty to the College"; and there is added, apparently as the crowning instance of this unwillingness or inability, that "under trying circumstances, when President Slocum was absent and untiringly at work to complete an endowment campaign, and when the Board was entitled to the active support of the Faculty for the welfare of the College, Mr. Parsons opposed and endeavored to nullify the policies of the Trustees."

Taking these four sentences together, they appear to mean that Dean Parsons was not dismissed because he urged that President Slocum should resign; nor because the Trustees resented an alleged exposure by him of financial irregularities; but because of certain acts of his in some way connected with the series of events thus vaguely indicated; which acts, taken in connection with his alleged troublesome behavior in general, already discussed, and more

especially when taken in connection with an offensive instance of interference with the policies of the Trustees, during the absence of the President while completing the endowment, appeared to the Trustees sufficient cause for his dismissal.

From the statement of Mr. Stewart, it appears that the offensive acts so vaguely mentioned are the following:

(a) In 1911, Professor Parsons and Professor Gile were informed of certain supposed irregularities in college accounts; and instead of taking the matter to the financial committee of the Board of Trustees, they carried it to Mr. Henry C. Hall, then attorney for the College, who in turn reported it to Messrs. Stewart and Howbert, to whom it should have gone in the first place.

(b) In November, 1915, Dean Parsons disregarded the authority of the Trustees still more flagrantly, by concealing from them the charges against President Slocum, and carrying these charges, or having them carried, to persons in the town; so that they eventually were laid before the three trustees by Judge Lunt, after he had learned them from these persons.

(c) After the Board of Trustees, at its meeting in June, 1916, had appointed an Administrative Committee of five members of the faculty, to look after these internal affairs of the college, Dean Parsons directed one of this committee to withdraw, telling him that the faculty would not allow him to remain on it.

(d) When the Trustees learned of this, they decided that it was hopeless to try any plan of administration which required the co-operation of Dean Parsons and those influenced by him, and that the administration must be put in the hands of President Slocum until his successor was appointed. On being informed of this decision by Mr. Stewart, and told that the Trustees expected the loyal support of all the faculty in carrying out the measures they had found necessary, Dean Parsons organized a faculty revolt, and published the charges against President Slocum to Trustees who had not known them previously, and need not have known them at all, since those of the Trustees who did were taking all necessary measures.

(e) During the year 1916-17, Dean Parsons was directly responsible for some of the instances in which the scandal in regard to the President was made known to outsiders.

It may be noted in passing that none of these charges exactly correspond to the attempt "to nullify the policies of the Trustees"

which is mentioned in the last sentence of the paragraph of the circular letter just discussed. The two instances of alleged interference with decisions of the Trustees, mentioned in (c) and (d), occurred in June, 1916, and August, 1916, respectively, and President Slocum did not leave Colorado Springs to complete the endowment fund until the middle of October of that year. The reference to the absence of the President on an endowment campaign appears to be a rhetorical embellishment.

The testimony, and findings of the committee, on the charges of Mr. Stewart, and the implications of the letter of the Trustees, are as follows:

(A) *The Incident of 1911.*

The statement of Dean Parsons in regard to this matter is as follows:

"Rumors of financial irregularities had come to Professor Gile and myself, and wishing to know whether or not they were of sufficient importance to take to the President, we consulted Mr. Henry C. Hall, now Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, then the college lawyer, a long-time and close friend of each of us. He was much disturbed and wished to speak to Mr. P. B. Stewart about the matter. We objected at first, but finally agreed to permit him to do so upon the understanding that, if it was decided that the information should go to the President, we wanted to take it ourselves; we wanted it to go to him by the front door and not by the back door. Mr. Hall agreed to this and told Mr. Stewart the rumors, and Mr. Stewart went immediately and told everything to President Slocum. Mr. Stewart denies he was put under bonds of secrecy and Mr. Hall's recollection on the point is not altogether clear."*

Mr. Stewart states that no injunction not to tell the President was laid on him by Mr. Hall, and that taking the matter to Mr. Hall first showed an injurious disregard for the authority and duties of the Trustees.

Professor Gile is not available as a witness, as he died at the end of 1915.

The following questions were sent to Mr. Hall by the chairman of the committee:

* Deposition of E. S. Parsons. The account of the discussion of this matter in the joint meeting of July 8, 1917, is given in the first section of the findings.

"Will you kindly state, for the information of the investigating committee, whether it appeared to you, under the circumstances at the time, that Mr. Parsons' action in coming to you with the matter was injurious to the proper authority of the Trustees? Also whether it appeared that Mr. Parsons wished to keep this matter concealed from persons who should have been informed of it? Or to use his own knowledge as a means of interference in the administration of the College?"

Mr. Hall's reply, under date of April 23, 1918, was as follows: "To each of these questions I answer no. Mr. Parsons and Mr. Gile had been on the faculty of Colorado College ever since—and before—I came to Colorado Springs in 1892. Some years later I became counsel for the College, and was privileged to serve it in that capacity until I retired from general practice in March, 1914, to enter upon my present duties. During the occasional absences of the President, Mr. Parsons had been Acting President, and in that capacity had been accustomed to consult me as the President did when there. I was not counsel personally of Mr. Parsons or Mr. Gile. They came together, stating that they did not know where else to go under the circumstances, and seeking, as I understood, in the interest of the College, and especially of its endowment funds, advice and guidance as to what should be done in view of successive public statements which could not be reconciled, and so far as I know, never have been reconciled, except that the President under the circumstances attending various gifts and benefactions to the College considered himself authorized by the donors to treat them either as contributions to the endowment funds or to other purposes of the College.

As the endowment funds of a College are trust funds in the highest sense, and both of these men had long been identified with the College, they were genuinely and deeply concerned.

With the lapse of the intervening years it is difficult for me to speak definitely, and I have no memoranda here to which I can refer. My present impression is that, after looking into the matter and satisfying myself that discrepancies did exist in the public statements, I advised that they be brought to the attention of members of the finance committee of the Trustees with a view to audit if that should be deemed desirable, and that this course was followed. I was later informed that the audit was made and the funds found intact.

Mr. Parsons has clear recollection of a proviso that if the matter were to be brought to the attention of the President Mr. Gile and himself should be the first to do it, and says that both were greatly disturbed on learning that his proviso had been disregarded. My own recollection, as I said, is not clear. But it certainly did not appear that Mr. Parsons or Mr. Gile wished to keep this matter concealed from persons who should have been informed of it, or that either wished to use his knowledge of it as a means of interference in the administration of the College.

All of these men, the President, the Trustees on the finance committee, and these members of the faculty, have honored me with their friendship. I have worked with them for the College for many years, and the same devotion to its best interests which had been evidenced throughout my relations with them in

College matters was to my mind animating Mr. Parsons and Mr. Gile in bringing the matter to me as counsel for the College."

These statements of Mr. Hall appear to the committee to be conclusive. Professor Parsons and Professor Gile did not come to him reporting rumors or making charges. They came to him seeking advice from the counsel for the College, and the occasion for seeking it was serious and sufficient. It would have been absurd to select him for this purpose with the idea that he would conceal their information, if important, from the administrative authorities, or allow them to use it to the prejudice of the institution of which he was the attorney. Moreover, Mr. Hall is convinced that the only motive which animated them was devotion to the best interests of the College, of which Mr. Parsons was Vice-President. In the light of Mr. Hall's explanation of the facts, the complaint that the matter was not taken first to Messrs. Stewart and Howbert appears trivial and inconsequential, especially as the resentment which has been strongly expressed against Dean Parsons for this appears not to have been attached to Professor Gile, who was equally involved.

The committee finds that this complaint is in part without weight, and in part not sustained.

(B) The Manner in which the Charges against the President Were First Brought to the Knowledge of Trustees.

The complaint of the Trustees in regard to this is that Mr. Parsons, after he had been informed of these charges, carried them, or had them carried, to persons in the town; that when they had thus been put in circulation, they were reported to Judge Lunt, a former trustee; and that he insisted on reporting them to Messrs. Howbert and Stewart.

Professor Cajori states that after the four professors had been apprised of the charges, "Parsons, Hills, and Schneider were of the opinion that the President's resignation should be called for through the Trustees, at once. I myself was considering whether this affair could not be satisfactorily adjusted, if we four men, or else just one of us, should go to the President directly, inform him of the charges, and warn him to be on his guard against repetitions. . . . That by my proposed mode of procedure the desired good and best interests of Colorado College could be reached, seemed to us far from certain. A few weeks later, information concerning these charges

reached the Trustees through an indirect channel; — and — had consulted a friend, Dr. Mary R. Noble, a graduate of the College, now a physician in Colorado Springs. Dr. Noble had in turn talked the matter over with Rev. Mr. Taft, the rector of the Episcopal Church, and he had consulted a friend, Mr. Dodge. . . . The whole story was then laid before Mr. Dodge's father-in-law, Judge Lunt, a former trustee, and through him the charges were brought to the knowledge of two trustees, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Howbert. Soon after the charges were communicated to a third Trustee, Judge Campbell, of Denver.”*

The committee has compared with this account the accounts of Messrs. Parsons, Hills and Schneider; Dr. Noble, Mr. Taft, and the two complainants who made the charges referred to, have been personally examined on the matter. It appears from this testimony that the order and method of transmission of information concerning the charges, until it reached two trustees, is correctly narrated by Dean Cajori. It further appears that the two complainants had reported their charges to other persons, and especially to Dr. Noble, before they informed Dean Parsons of them.

There is, however, as might be expected, some variance of recollection as to how far the four professors, or any of them, were informed of, or assented to, Dr. Noble's communication to Mr. Taft, or Mr. Taft's communication to Mr. Dodge. Dean Parsons' recollection is as follows:

“The suggestion, as I remember the incident” (viz., that Dr. Noble should consult Mr. Taft), “came originally from her, but it was discussed in the group of four, and the approval of the four was given to her telling Mr. Taft. Mr. Dodge was not told the story by Dr. Noble and Mr. Taft, but by Mr. Taft alone. My recollection is that Mr. Taft suggested speaking to Mr. Dodge. Whether he should do so or not was discussed at great length in the committee of four. After a good deal of hesitation, Professor Cajori, considering meanwhile whether he could accomplish the desired end by going himself with the story directly to the President, and deciding against this course, the four agreed to let Mr. Taft tell Mr. Dodge. Mr. Taft's motive was to get Mr. Dodge's wisdom as to the best course to pursue, all of us being utterly perplexed. Mr. Dodge then told Judge Lunt without our knowledge or consent.

* Deposition of F. Cajori.

The four were taken by surprise when the knowledge came to them of what had been done."*

Dr. Noble also states that her recollection is that she suggested her consultation of Mr. Taft. Mr. Taft states positively that Dean Parsons had nothing whatever to do with the matter of reporting the charges to Mr. Dodge and to Mr. Lunt; that he has no reason to believe that Dean Parsons suggested that the matter should first be taken to others, rather than directly to the Trustees; and that the information was given to Judge Lunt expressly for the purpose of having him convey it directly to the Board of Trustees.

It appears from this testimony that Dean Parsons was not responsible for the first information given to persons outside of the group of four professors; and that he did not carry information, or have it carried, to other persons, although it is his recollection that he assented, along with his colleagues, to this being done in two cases. It also appears that the motive in each of these cases was to obtain consultation and advice, and that it was not the intention of the four professors that the charges should reach the Trustees in this way.

The complaint is therefore, not sustained, especially as against Dean Parsons separately from his colleagues.

At the same time, the committee considers that some slight measure of blame attaches to the four professors for their behavior in this phase of the affair. It believes that their motive in what they did, or failed to do, was a sincere desire for the good of Colorado College, and that they were genuinely perplexed and doubtful as to what it was best to do. It also recognises that it is difficult for outsiders to appraise exactly the personal difficulties involved, and that the subsequent events seem to show the slight weight their unsupported protest might have had against the dominant authority of the President. Nevertheless, the procedure fairest to all concerned, and the one demanded by their personal and official responsibilities, would have been, so soon as they were satisfied that the situation demanded immediate action, either to have taken the charges to the President in a body, or to have laid them before the Trustees.

However, the blame for their failure to do this does not attach to Dean Parsons apart from his fellows; and in any case, the Trustees are completely estopped from alleging it as a ground justifying

*Deposition of E. S. Parsons

his dismissal, since the Trustees informed not only did not complain of it at the time, but seem to have been gratified that the matter was not yet known either to the President or to their fellow trustees.

(C) *The Alleged Dictation of the Membership of the Administration Committee.*

This complaint of the Trustees is that after the Board, at its meeting in June, 1916, had appointed a Faculty Administrative Committee of five, including the three "academic" deans, Parsons, Cajori, and Persons, and also the Dean of Women, Miss Loomis, and the Secretary of the College, Professor R. H. Motten, that Mr. Parsons directed Mr. Motten to withdraw from this committee, telling him that the faculty would not allow him to serve on it.

Dean Cajori's account of this incident has been quoted elsewhere in this report. Professor Schneider's account is as follows:

"On commencement day, 1916, about five o'clock, the four of us met with Mr. Howbert in the Portland office. After leaving him we walked up Nevada Avenue discussing the make-up of the committee, from all angles. We were persuaded that it was an impossible committee. . . . Immediately after supper we met at Dean Parsons', and decided we must see Mr. Howbert at once. Dr. Cajori . . . called up Mr. Howbert by telephone. . . . According to my memory of that occasion, I alone prompted Dr. Cajori as he telephoned. There was no prompting that I can recall, while I was telephoning to Mr. Howbert. Thursday morning, at the suggestion of Mr. Howbert, the four of us met with President Slocum. At this meeting, I, as spokesman of the group, explained the situation and urged a satisfactory and safe working committee. President Slocum then agreed that a committee of three Deans—Cajori, Parsons, and Persons—would be better, and promised to make the adjustment with the Trustees."*

A memorandum of Professor Hills made the day following this interview with the President, and also the account given by Dean Parsons, agree with the narratives of Messrs. Cajori and Schneider. Professor Hills says in part: "We talked it all over, and came to the unanimous opinion that such a committee was not an efficient one and one that would command the respect of the faculty, as Motten is young. . . . Moreover, a committee of five was too large for quick action. . . . Finally Schneider called Howbert

* Letter of E. C. Schneider to F. Caldwell.

up over the telephone and told him frankly that he thought the Trustees and the President had not kept their agreement, and that we thought the whole situation was bad."

The incident complained of occurred on Thursday, immediately before the call on the President suggested by Mr. Howbert. Mr. Parsons says: "I did, on the impulse of the moment, the one thing which was done without the unanimous consent of the faculty group. Professor Motten happened to come into my office. I said to him that as a friend of long standing, I advised him not to take the position on the committee. I told him I was sure it would not help him in the faculty, knowing as I did the feeling of the faculty men towards him. This advice was wholly personal and was given in full sincerity. . . . What I did was an act of friendship which I should not hesitate to perform again under the same circumstances."*

The following testimony by Professor Schneider is also relevant:

"Parsons then had an interview with Professor Motten." (This statement is introduced so as to place the interview after the meeting with the President.) "Motten came to me and told of the conversation he had had with Dean Parsons. He said: 'Dean Parsons came to me as a friend to advise me.' At that time he had taken no offence. He wished my opinion, and he said that he believed the committee was too large to get results. Sometime during the last half of July or early in August, he again spoke to me of the committee, saying he did not see how he could withdraw from the committee until the Trustees had informed him of his appointment. President Slocum alone had informed him."†

There is, however, some contrary testimony from Professor Motten. In answer to the question: "Do you think Dr. Parsons' asking you to leave the committee of five was prompted by friendship for you or a desire to dictate the membership of the committee?" Mr. Motten says: "By a desire to dictate the membership of the committee. I was not the only member that he wanted to have off the committee. He wanted two of us to leave—both of us favorable to Dr. Slocum. When the committee was first appointed and Dr. Parsons knew about it, he spoke most graciously to me of it, and gave no intimation that he thought it unwise for me to remain on the committee. Later, when he found that I was not on their side,

* Deposition of E. S. Parsons.

† Letter of E. C. Schneider to F. Caldwell.

he asked me to resign, which I offered to do, and was told by a member of the Board that my resignation would not be acceptable to them.”*

These statements of Mr. Motten are in complete and obvious contradiction with those of Messrs. Parsons and Schneider. It also appears to be impossible to fit the sequence of events stated by Mr. Motten into that contained in the concordant narratives of the four professors, one of which was written at the time. According to the latter (1) the Board acted Tuesday, June 16; (2) Wednesday afternoon Professor Schneider informed Professor Hills of this action; (3) at five that afternoon the four professors called on Mr. Howbert; (4) early in the evening they met, decided that the committee was unsatisfactory, and so informed Mr. Howbert; (5) next morning they called on the President, and he agreed to call a special meeting and recommend that the three academic deans be the administrative committee. By Wednesday evening, then, the four professors had unanimously decided that Mr. Motten’s presence on the committee was not acceptable to them. It does not seem probable that in the space of twenty-four hours or less Dean Parsons would have congratulated Professor Motten on his appointment, learned that he was “favorable to Dr. Slocum,” and for this reason informed him that he could not remain on the committee. This is what must have occurred, on Mr. Motten’s statement, if the interview with him of Dean Parsons took place, as the latter states, just before seeing the President. And as the President agreed to recommend the change of the committee, there would have been no point in offering either advice or threats to Mr. Motten thereafter, as the President himself informed him of the change that same day.†

The committee are, therefore, of the opinion that the interview with Mr. Motten took place, as stated by Dean Parsons, immediately before that with the President; and that the account of this interview given by Dean Parsons, and corroborated by the testimony of Professor Schneider as to the subsequent statements of Professor Motten, is correct, viz., that this interview was of the nature of friendly advice. The complaint of the Trustees, that in this interview Mr. Parsons “directed” Mr. Motten to withdraw from the committee, is not sustained by the evidence. If the

* Statement of R. H. Motten.

† Memorandum of E. C. Hills.

Trustees have any complaint in the matter, it must be directed, not against any special act of Mr. Parsons personally in reference to Mr. Motten, but against the concordant action of Mr. Parsons and his colleagues in openly remonstrating with Mr. Howbert and the President, and of Mr. Parsons and Mr. Cajori in declining to serve on the administrative committee as formed by the Trustees.

Even under normal conditions, the protest of two of the deans and two senior professors against the membership of a faculty committee would surely not be regarded as injurious to the proper authority of the Trustees of a college or a university. In fact, in most institutions of the rank of Colorado College, the appointment of a faculty committee by the Board of Trustees, without previous consultation with the faculty, would be regarded as unusual. And in this case, as has been seen, the four professors had a special reason for their protest in the reasonable suspicion that the agreement made by the two trustees and the President was not being carried out in spirit as well as in letter.

(D) The Complaint that the Letter of Protest Sent to the Trustees in August, 1916, Was Due to a Faculty Revolt Organized by Dean Parsons.

The committee considers that this matter has been sufficiently discussed in the foregoing section of this report. It there appeared that the only step for which Mr. Parsons was separately and individually responsible was his narrative of Mr. Stewart's conversation with him on August 14, which narrative Mr. Stewart acknowledged to be correct; and that the subsequent acts of Messrs. Parsons, Cajori, and Hills, in revealing the situation to some of their colleagues, and of the twelve professors in sending this letter to the Trustees, were warranted by the fact that the agreement made by Messrs. Howbert and Stewart was not being carried out, and by the reasonable belief that its execution was necessary in the interests of Colorado College.

The complaint is, therefore, not sustained.

(E) The Complaint that, During the Academic Year 1916-17, Dean Parsons Was Responsible for Some Instances in which the Charges against President Slocum Were Made Known to Persons not Before Informed.

Of the nine professors who, together with Messrs. Parsons, Cajori, and Hills, signed the letter to the Trustees, direct testimony from

four relevant to the prior discretion of Dean Parsons is at hand, and implied testimony from a fifth. Messrs. Howe, Woodbridge, and Parish state that their first knowledge of the charges came to them through the conferences held in August, 1916; this is also implied as to Mr. Persons. Professor M. D. Ormes testifies that he heard a vague report of such charges from a person connected with the College (not one of the four professors) in May, 1916; that he questioned Dean Parsons, his intimate friend, as to what was meant by that, and he said that there was nothing to be said, that he could not say anything, or something like that; and that Dean Parsons told him nothing until August, at the time the larger group of professors were called into consultation.*

Mr. Charles W. Haines testifies that he was Dean Parsons' close personal friend, and also his legal adviser; but that Mr. Parsons did not inform him of these charges until August, 1916, when he was consulted in regard to the statement to be sent to the Trustees.

The Rev. Arthur Taft testifies that it did not appear that the fact that such charges had been made was becoming known quite generally in the town until the early summer of 1917.

The antecedent probability is, therefore, against Dean Parsons having given publicity to these charges during the months between August, 1916, and July, 1917. The Trustees mentioned no specific instances, and the committee have been able to find only two instances in which such behavior was charged or rather two complaints, for it is left uncertain whether they refer to different instances or not.

In the first of these instances, the witness stated that he knew of one instance in which Dean Parsons had given unnecessary publicity to the charges; but on being requested to give an account of this instance, he replied that the matter was "given to (him) in confidence, and that (he) could not violate that confidence to give (us) the details." The committee have, therefore, rejected this statement, as not susceptible of verification.

A certain conversation with Mr. Myron S. Collins, the editor of the *Colorado Springs Evening Telegraph*, has been repeatedly mentioned, it appears, as an instance of an attempt on the part of Dean Parsons to have the charges against President Slocum published. Professor Schneider, who was with Dean Parsons on this occasion, gives the following account of this incident:

* Examination of M. D. Ormes.

"Thursday morning, the day after commencement, 1917, Dean Parsons called Dr. Cajori and myself over to his house to consult with him regarding a report he had had late Wednesday evening, in which it was told that Mr. Collins of the *Evening Telegraph* had said that a member of the Board of Trustees had said to him that the whole trouble at the College was a frame-up by a little group of disloyal faculty men, led by Dean Parsons, and that the Trustees meant now to dismiss some of this group. After some discussion we decided that it would be best to go directly to Collins to inquire whether the Trustees had said these things. Because Dr. Cajori had been asked by members of the Board of Trustees to take the acting presidency, and because he expected to meet with the trustee who was reported to have made the remark, it was decided that Mr. Parsons and I go to Collins without Cajori. By telephone we at once arranged to meet Collins in the Gazette Building where the *Telegraph* is printed. In reply to our questioning, Collins said that he had been led to believe "that an injustice had been done to Dr. Slocum". He denied that the member of the Board of Trustees had said the Trustees would dismiss members of the faculty. Because Mr. Collins had been misinformed, Dean Parsons then outlined briefly to Mr. Collins the history of the trouble at the College, and read parts of some of the statements. Not once was any request made that the story be published, nor was any hint given to that effect. Furthermore, none of the evidence was left with Mr. Collins. We definitely said to him that our purpose in coming was to find out if the report concerning the remarks of the Trustee was true. We also said that we felt, since he had a Trustee's version, he ought to know the faculty side of the trouble at the College."*

Mr. Collins, when examined by members of the committee, stated that a member of the college faculty—not Dean Parsons—had requested him not to publish anything in praise of Dr. Slocum, and had referred to the charges against him as a reason for not doing so; that shortly thereafter he had been asked by a trustee to publish an editorial in recognition of Dr. Slocum's services, in connection with his retirement; that he had then called upon this trustee to ask him concerning the objections made to doing what had been requested; and that this trustee had assured him that the charges were trivial or groundless, and that a cruel injustice had been done to Dr. Slocum; that he then informed this unnamed faculty member of the circumstances of this interview, and his own conviction

* Letter of E. C. Schneider to F. S. Caldwell.

as a result that an injustice had been done; and that the call of Dean Parsons and Professor Schneider had followed. His answers in regard to the events of the interview follow:

" . . . of his visit to you with Dr. Schneider. A. What his object was of course, is opinion. MR. LEFEVRE: He didn't request you to publish anything? A. No. He didn't request me. MR. HOLLANDS: At the time, the same time, he furnished you with the special object of his visit? A. When he came in, either he or Mr. Schneider, I forget which, said that they had heard that I had said that this trustee that I had been to see, who asked me for an editorial, had said that they were going to fire him, and wanted to know if that was so. I said it was not so. I said I told him if that was so that they certainly ought to be canned. It was my suggestion that there ought to be a wholesale cleaning out—my suggestion—not the trustee's. Then he went on and told me in a general way and brought out these . . . statements."*

On comparing this testimony with that of Dr. Schneider, it is clear that the purpose of Dean Parsons, in this interview, was to defend himself and his colleagues against grave charges of misbehavior. It is also clear that there was occasion for doing this, since the statements of the trustee to Mr. Collins had been of such a character as to lead Mr. Collins, an alumnus of the College, to say that all these members of the faculty should be dismissed. There was nothing said or done that could be interpreted as meaning that publicity was desired, and no material left which would have made publication possible. If this is one of the reasons for this complaint of the Trustees, it does not appear to the committee to be a valid one. At the same time, it does appear that Dean Parsons was ill-advised in entering into details in his statement to Mr. Collins, and not confining himself to a general explanation of the fact that the faculty had acted for what he believed to be the best interest of the College. This indiscretion was excusable by the exciting circumstances. The much graver indiscretion was that of the unnamed member of the faculty, whose foolish and unnecessary zeal started the chain of events leading up to this incident.

In sum, the committee finds that none of the complaints alleged by the Trustees as grounds for the dismissal of Dean Parsons, so far as they have been able to discover them, are sustained by the evidence.

* Examination of Myron S. Colline, March 2, 1917.

The complaint that Dean Parsons had obstinately refused reasonable offers of an equitable settlement of the controversy, since his dismissal, will be discussed in the following section, together with the acts of the present President of Colorado College, Dr. C. A. Duniway, in relation to the case of Dean Parsons.

IV. PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY ARISING FROM THE DISMISSAL.

In the third and fourth paragraph of their circular letter, the Trustees state that Dean Parsons had shown the truth of their judgment of him by the fact that "his actions then" (*i. e.*, at the time of his dismissal), "and since prove that he was not willing to submit his case to the decision of the Board of Trustees, after hearings which they were always willing to hold," and that he has rejected two proffers of settlement for the controversy.

The weight of these statements can best be estimated by means of a narrative of the various acts of the Trustees and of President Duniway in this matter, between the date of the dismissal and that of the circular letter to the alumni, together with the events which led up to these acts, so far as the circumstances have not been sufficiently recounted in the preceding section. Testimony or evidence will be cited only where the matters mentioned are not evident facts of public knowledge.

The conference or joint meeting between the executive committee of the Trustees and the faculty, on July 8, 1917, was in no sense a hearing, as has been seen already. On July 9 Dean Parsons was formally dismissed. On July 10, in conversation with Mr. Howbert, Dean Cajori was informed that the Trustees intended to give a hearing to Professor Albright, or that he, Mr. Howbert, thought that Professor Albright should have a hearing; whereupon Dean Cajori asked Mr. Howbert if such a hearing could not be given to Dean Parsons also, and Mr. Howbert replied that it could not.*

On July 17, Messrs. Cajori and Schneider, as members of the group of four professors, and also as members of the faculty executive committee, addressed a letter of protest to each member of the Board, against the dismissal of Dean Parsons, against the refusal to give him a hearing on charges, and against singling him out as especially responsible for things done with the consent and approval of all four professors. "Only one of the trustees acknowledged the

* Depositions of F. Cajori and E. S. Parsons.

receipt of this letter; no action was taken by them." On July 21, after a prolonged discussion of the case with Messrs. Stewart, Shove, and Vance of the Board of Trustees, Messrs. Cajori and Schneider handed to Mr. Stewart a formal request for a "re-opening" of the case of Dean Parsons. It should be remembered that Dean Cajori was the chairman of the faculty executive committee. No reply to this request was received until November 16, at which time President Duniway informed Dean Cajori of the action of the Board proposing "mediation."*

August 4, Mr. Stewart addressed a note to Dean Parsons asking him to meet with members of the Board of Trustees on the afternoon of the 7th. In accordance with this request, Mr. Parsons appeared before a group of five trustees. He testifies that he stated to these trustees, at the beginning and also at the end of their discussion, that he did not regard this as a hearing, and that they agreed that it was not. It was clearly not a hearing in any judicial sense, since no official statement of charges was supplied to Mr. Parsons before it took place, no one was present save the Trustees and himself, no witnesses were called or evidence adduced, and the trustees present were not a quorum of the Board.†

August 14, Mr. Caldwell, acting for a group of alumni, sent a letter to the Board, which has already been quoted. The hearing requested for this group was granted, but the statement of charges desired was not supplied. At the hearing, August 25, the Trustees denied that the charges discussed were the real grounds on which they had dismissed Dean Parsons, although these charges appear to have been in large part identical with those matters about which the five Trustees had questioned Mr. Parsons a week before. In consequence of this repudiation of the charges discussed by the alumni, on August 27 Mr. Caldwell again addressed a letter to the Trustees, asking for an official statement of the grounds for the dismissal; and in the last paragraph of this letter, already quoted, he stated that if this were done, Dean Parsons was prepared to appear before the Board and submit to examination on these charges, in the presence of the alumni. The Trustees took no notice whatever of this letter.‡

* Deposition of F. Cajori, and letters in Appendix B.

† Deposition of E. S. Parsons; as to the preliminary arrangements for this conference, depositions of George M. Howe and Atherton Noyes.

‡ Deposition of F. Caldwell.

August 30, the Board held a formal meeting, before which it heard several petitioners and remonstrants in the Parsons matter, including the pastors of Congregational churches in Denver and Colorado Springs. It is to be noted that by this time Dr. C. A. Duniway had become President of Colorado College, and, therefore, shares responsibility with the Board for their acts in this matter on and after this date. At this meeting, the Board came to a decision which President Duniway announced to Mr. Parsons in the following letter:

“COLORADO COLLEGE,
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.
August 31, 1917.

“DEAN EDWARD S. PARSONS

“*My dear Dean Parsons:* I wish hereby to report to you the following action of the Trustees of Colorado College, taken at the meeting yesterday, August 30. ‘That the Board approve the recommendation of President Duniway, and hereby reconsider and rescind the dismissal of Dean Parsons, reinstating him in his position in the faculty, but with leave of absence for the collegiate year 1917–18, and with postponement of determination of his continuing status in the College until June, 1918.’

“Believing that action is the best solution obtainable in very complicated and difficult circumstances, and hoping that you will soon be able to arrange satisfactorily for profitable use of your year’s leave of absence, I am

“Very truly,

“C. A. DUNIWAY,
“President.”

On the following day Mr. Parsons handed a letter to President Duniway, requesting an interpretation of this action of “reinstatement,” and received a written reply as follows:

“Your understanding is correct, that your status, under the action taken by the Board on August 30, will be essentially the same as that of any other member of the Faculty, in that, after the close of the year 1917–18, you would still remain dean and head professor of English, unless dismissed from either or both positions by the Board of Trustees, after an adequate bearing.”*

* Letters of E. S. Parsons and C. A. Duniway, September 1, 1917.

Mr. Parsons states that when he presented his letter of inquiry to President Duniway, the latter insisted that two changes be made in the question asked therein, which read in its original form as follows:

"If so, apparently, my status, if I accept the proposition of the Board, will be essentially the same as that of any other member of the faculty, *and* after the close of the year 1917-18, I shall remain dean and head professor of English unless I am dismissed from *these positions, etc.*" Mr. Parsons states that "Dr. Duniway insisted that I change the underlined 'and' to 'in that,' and the expression 'from these positions' to 'from either or both positions.'" It will be seen that President Duniway used these expressions in his reply.*

A few days after this interchange of letters, a committee of the Denver Chapter of the Colorado College Alumni called upon President Duniway, in order to secure exact information regarding the meaning of the action taken by himself and the Trustees. In reply to their questions, they were informed that "the enforced leave of absence of Dean Parsons referred to in the resolutions was without pay, and that the action of the Trustees merely postponed the determination of the status of Dean Parsons, which was in the meantime not that of the other members of the faculty," in that they were not under charges, and he was.†

Having this information before him, Dean Parsons naturally declined to accept this ungenerous proposal for a "settlement" of the troublesome controversy, at his own expense, in which the sole definite assurance for the future was the promise, by the President, but not by the Board, that he would not be dismissed at the end of the year until a hearing of some sort had taken place.

President Duniway states that he arranged this "settlement" in good faith, as the utmost he could secure from the Board of Trustees, and in the hopes that the interval of "leave of absence" might allow all persons concerned in the controversy to take a calmer view of it. It appears to this committee that he should not have made himself responsible for such a proposal, which must seem to third parties to be in the interest only of his own personal convenience, since it required a professor who insisted that he had been deeply injured by the Trustees, to accept a year's suspension with-

* Deposition of E. S. Parsons, in reply to questions, March 23, 1918.

† Resolutions of Denver Chapter, published September 12, 1917; depositions of E. S. Parsons and F. Caldwell.

out pay, under charges left indefinite, as a "settlement," in return for the assurance that he would not be dismissed at the end of the year or later until after a hearing had taken place, presumably before the same persons who had dismissed him in the first place.

About this time, on or about September 12, another plan for terminating the controversy was proposed by Mr. Henry C. Hall. In conference with various members of the faculty and representatives of the alumni, Mr. Hall proposed that the Trustees, the Faculty, and Dean Parsons should each select members of a board of arbitration; that this board should consider the difficulties which had arisen in the administration of the College in general, as well as in the case of Dean Parsons in particular; and that all parties should agree in advance to abide by its decisions in these matters, whatever they might be. These proposals were accepted by the Faculty members consulted, and also by Dean Parsons. They were then informally presented to members of the Board of Trustees; but the Board did not take any action to carry out the proposed plan, which would have provided an equitable settlement of the matters in controversy, by a judicial and final decision.

On September 27 the Annual Conference of Congregational Churches in Colorado met, and adopted resolutions in which they condemned the action of the Board of Trustees in the Parsons case, requested the immediate and unconditional reinstatement of Dean Parsons, and asked that if this were not done the Trustees should submit the controversy to arbitration. The final paragraph of these resolutions reads:

"Resolved further, that, if the Trustees find it impossible to agree to such reinstatement, we recommend the submission of the whole controversy to a board of arbitration as suggested by the faculty and the alumni associations of Denver, Pike's Peak, and Pueblo, it being understood that Dean Parsons, the Faculty, the alumni association, and the Trustees pledge themselves to abide by the findings of the arbitration board."

President Duniway had made a statement to the conference before these resolutions were adopted, in which he presented the view of the controversy taken by himself. It was afterwards reported, by several witnesses, that he said, in effect, that only fourteen or sixteen members of a faculty of over sixty were in sympathy with Dean Parsons.* Because of this and other remarks of President

* Statements of Rev. Fred Staff, Rev. F. L. Moore, and Mrs. J. R. Gile.

Duniway at this time, a meeting of about thirty members of the faculty, on the afternoon of October 19, decided that the entire faculty should be canvassed, each member being asked to indicate his or her attitude in regard to the dismissal of Dean Parsons; and that President Duniway should be asked to meet with the men of the faculty and explain his statements. The results of the canvass which followed are stated as follows:

"According to the published lists, there are, in 1917-18, 49 members of the Colorado College Faculty. Of the 49 members, 42 are in residence and 7 on leave of absence. Two of those on leave of absence are in the military service of the government, and have either not received or have not replied to communications sent them. All of the remaining members of the faculty have been canvassed, the following questions being asked: 'What is your position concerning the dismissal of Dean Parsons? Do you object to the action of the Trustees, do you favor such action, or are you neutral?' Of the 49 members, 40 signed a statement 'objecting to the action of the Trustees,' the two members who are in service are known to hold the same position, three (all new men this year) sign as neutrals, and four refused to commit themselves."*

The meeting with President Duniway occurred on the evening of October 18. Twenty-two of the 26 male members of the faculty were present. It is unnecessary to report the details of the discussion concerning the statements said to have been made before the conference in Pueblo. Towards the end of the meeting, the talk turned on the policy of the college administration for the future. The following account is given by one of those present of the proceedings at this point:

"Professor Schneider made it quite clear that the faculty felt that President Duniway was on the side of the Trustees and could not be trusted to represent the position of the Faculty to the Board; consequently there could be no sympathy between them. . . . Professor Strieby made a long and very convincing plea for the adoption of the arbitration plan; the College was rapidly losing a constituency built up by years of patient endeavor on the part of unusually capable men. . . . He felt the arbitration proposal gave the Trustees a great opportunity to save the College and their own faces at the same time. Dean Cajori also made a very eloquent speech in support of arbitration; he regarded it as absolutely the only salvation for the College, and appealed to President Duniway to use all the influence he had with the Trustees to secure its acceptance; . . . if the President would only come out and take this stand for justice firmly, he was sure the Trustees would yield to his recommendation, and he would win the loyal co-operation of his faculty. To all this President Duniway replied that he was practically certain the Trustees would never consent to arbitrate the Parsons case; they regarded that as closed; he did not feel that he could recommend it to them. He had been told when he came here that the Trustees would

* Affidavit of Professors Persons and Ellingwood, with original signatures.

accept the entire responsibility for the action taken last July, that he was not to accept any responsibility at all, that he was to keep out of it. Of course, he said, it had been impossible to keep out of it altogether, but he was still reluctant to enter into it any more than he had to. When he came to the point where he could no longer carry out the will of the Board, he felt it was his duty to resign. Finally, in answer to further appeals, he suggested that perhaps a few members of the faculty might meet with him and see if they could not agree upon some plan of limited arbitration, which he could conscientiously urge upon the Board—in fact he would suggest that these same members of the faculty go with him before the Board and present their case themselves.”*

At about this time a mass-meeting of the student body instructed the “Student Commission” to inquire into the controversy. This commission held a meeting on October 30, sending requests to members of the Board of Trustees, the faculty, and alumni, and also to President Duniway, to be present at that time, several days before. No Trustees were present, but a prolonged discussion of various matters connected with the case took place. The report of this commission was presented to a student mass-meeting on November 9. This meeting then unanimously adopted resolutions addressed to the Board of Trustees, urging that “an immediate settlement is necessary both for the maintenance of the academic standing of Colorado College among other colleges and for the preservation of the value of a degree to the individual student,” and concluded as follows:

Resolved, that we, the students of Colorado College, in special meeting assembled, do hereby urge upon the Trustees of this institution a reconsideration of their action towards Dr. Parsons, either by means of the method of arbitration already proposed by Henry C. Hall, or by a fair and impartial hearing at which Faculty members have an opportunity to present their side of the case.”

On November 16 the Board of Trustees met, and adopted a minute which, after recounting under ten heads the communications addressed to them, since their action of August 30, in regard to the case of Dean Parsons, proceeds as follows:

Be it resolved, that we, the members of the Board of Trustees of Colorado College, notwithstanding our opinion that the dismissal of Dr. E. S. Parsons in July last, was justified by his conduct in collegiate matters, and by his attitude towards this Board, declare our continued willingness to grant him further hearings for the presentation of any material evidence which he may wish to lay before us. Not only was this implied by our vote of August 30 to reinstate him, but he was assured in writing that he would not again be dismissed unless such action should be decided upon after an adequate hearing. Should he request it, a hearing

* Deposition of Professor A. R. Ellingwood.

will be expedited, to be given as promptly as it can be satisfactorily arranged. From the information now before us it appears that Dr. Parsons does not ask or desire this Board to grant him a hearing, and therefore, we take no further action on the subject at this time.

Be it resolved, that we would be willing for the sake of conciliation to provide for a full investigation by a disinterested educator as mediator, asking him to make recommendations for the wise settlement of controversy regarding the case of Dean Parsons. The choice of a distinguished educator as mediator we would leave to agreement by President Argo, of the general Alumni Association, Dean Cajori of the Faculty, and Mr. Irving Howbert of this Board. To these ends Mr. Howbert is hereby authorized to take appropriate action on behalf of the Board, if it should appear to him that this proposal will be accepted by those concerned."

Mr. Parsons was informed of this action of the Board by a letter from President Duniway, in which the latter inquired what his wishes were in regard to the proposed "mediation."

After consultation with Professor A. A. Young, the Chairman of this Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, he replied as follows:

"Dec. 11, 1917.

"PRESIDENT C. A. DUNIWAY . . .

"*Dear Dr. Duniway*: . . . The plan, as I understood it, provides for the selection by a committee consisting of Mr. Howbert from the Trustees, Dean Cajori from the faculty, and Mr. Argo from the alumni, of a distinguished educator to act as a mediator in the College controversy. After a full investigation of the situation the mediator would make 'recommendations' for a wise settlement. The term used implies what you made plain to a faculty committee on November 19, that the suggestions of the mediator would be recommendations only, to be accepted or rejected by the Board of Trustees as they should decide after the recommendations should be made.

"In reply to the request of your letter, that I express my 'wishes' concerning this proposed plan, I would say, first: When, in September of the present year, the Trustees failed to accept my so-called ultimatum, which insisted upon unconditional reinstatement, the whole matter of my College status passed out of my hands into the hands of the alumni and faculty. Since that time the negotiations with the Trustees have been entirely conducted by them. I have had no share whatever in these negotiations.

"That the Trustees do not consider me a party to the present negotiations is to be clearly recognized in the composition of the committee they have selected. They have put on this committee one representative of each party to the controversy, namely: one trustee, one of the faculty, one of the alumni.

"As I am no longer, in the judgment of the Trustees, a member of the faculty, I am not, and I cannot become, in any sense a party to such mediation. It is not for me, but it is for the alumni and the faculty, to accept or reject the proposal.

"But, though I must, therefore, decline to be considered a party to the proposed mediation, the plan has my cordial approval. . . . For the sake of the Col-

lege, its present and its future, I sincerely hope that the alumni and the faculty will agree to it; and if, as a result of the mediation, the three parties unite upon a plan for the settlement of the controversy that they consider satisfactory, and it is something they feel should be submitted to me, I shall be most glad to give the proposal my very careful consideration.

"Yours very truly,

"EDWARD S. PARSONS."

At the same time, under date of December 10, Chairman Young sent a letter of explanation to President Duniway, in part as follows:

"I had a talk with Professor Parsons yesterday. He showed me his correspondence with you respecting the proposals for the appointment of a mediator. The proposal is, of course, a very difficult one for Professor Parsons to reject, because by so doing he may make himself appear to be particularly recalcitrant and stubborn. After some consideration, however, I thought I had to advise Professor Parsons not to accept the proposal of mediation; that is, not to make himself a party to mediation proceedings. The position Professor Parsons took in his letter to you, *viz.*, that as he was, in the judgment of the Trustees, no longer a member of the faculty of Colorado College, he could, therefore, not be a party to any mediation between different elements or interests in the institution, seems wholly sound. In addition, I have some doubt about the appropriateness of mediation proceedings in this particular kind of difficulty. Mediation almost always implies the existence of some possibility of 'give and take' in a dispute. It suggests compromise, mutual adjustment, and final agreement, upon middle ground. Now, from what I know, of the Colorado College situation, there are some difficulties that might very well be handled by mediation. But, by the very terms of their resolutions, it is clear that the Trustees have the very definite opinion that Professor Parsons' dismissal was wholly justified, while Professor Parsons and his friends are so thoroughly convinced that the dismissal was wholly unjustified that they ask for absolutely complete reinstatement. This is not a matter for mediation, it is a matter for judiciary decision.

"However, Professor Parsons, as I understand his position, welcomes mediation as a method of bringing about a better understanding between the various conflicting parties and elements in the College. If such mediation should result in general agreement between the faculty, the alumni, and the Trustees, as to what Professor Parsons' own attitude and actions should be he would, I am sure, be compelled to attach very great weight to such recommendations.

"I write this letter in order to help clarify Professor Parsons' own attitude, which seems to me the only one he could possibly take, and yet likely to be misinterpreted."

President Duniway replied to these letters as follows:

"December 18, 1917.

"DR. EDWARD S. PARSONS . . .

"*My dear Dr. Parsons:* I am in receipt of your letter of December 11 in which you state that you cannot become in any sense a party to mediation regarding your status in the faculty of Colorado College, which was proposed by the Trustees in one of their resolutions adopted on November 16.

"Inasmuch as you decline to participate in the proposed mediation, Mr. Howbert, who was asked to represent the Trustees in the choice of a mediator, will not proceed further in the suggested action.

"If I do not take up and answer various issues raised in your letter it is not because I admit the validity of the positions taken by you. The offer made by the Trustees to submit 'the case of Dean Parsons' to a disinterested mediator was made in good faith and in such terms that its success would not depend upon, and ought not to have been hindered by, technicalities.

"Very truly,

"C. A. DUNIWAY, President."

"December 18, 1917.

"PROFESSOR A. A. YOUNG . . .

"*My dear Professor Young:* I am in receipt of your letter of December 10 regarding the case of Dean Parsons, our proposal of mediation, and the committee which you appointed to report upon the Colorado College situation.

"It is apparent to me that you have been badly advised regarding the case of Dean Parsons. Not only 'may he make himself appear to be particularly recalcitrant and stubborn,' as you remark, but this is exactly what he has actually done. The proposal for mediation was made in good faith and was a reasonable way to bring about a settlement of difficulties if Dean Parsons really desired such settlement. The fact that by declining to accept an earlier action of the Board reinstating him he has kept himself from being now a member of the faculty makes no essential difference as far as mediation is concerned. The main point of the mediation would have been consideration and settlement of the question of reinstatement. Of course, if Dean Parsons continues to stand on the ultimatum announced last September, when he demanded, 'immediate, complete, and unconditional reinstatement,' with a guarantee that no charges against him would be revived, then mediation is impossible.

"The suggestion that mediation can proceed without his participation seems to me futile. If one of the principals to a difference will not participate in mediation there can be no real mediation. Professor Parsons has been so 'recalcitrant and stubborn' that in my opinion he has eliminated further consideration of measures for his reinstatement.

"Very truly,

"C. A. DUNIWAY, President."

Extended comment upon this last proposal of the Trustees, and the attitude taken by President Duniway in the correspondence just quoted, seems unnecessary to this committee. After a preliminary declaration of their continued firm conviction that the dismissal of Dean Parsons was wholly justified, in a preamble which incidentally, in its phrases concerning a "continued willingness to grant further hearings," and so on, seriously misstates or distorts the facts of record already recounted, the Trustees then went on to propose "mediation," and also to name all the members of the committee which was to select the mediator, thus excluding Dean Parsons from

any part in the proceedings. Moreover, the Trustees expected to treat the proposals of the mediator as recommendations only. This is the behavior of a judge, not of a party to mediation. In fact, through the letter of President Duniway, he and the Trustees in effect decline to proceed with the plan, unless Professor Parsons will make himself a party to mediation proceedings in which he is not represented, to which the Trustees themselves do not become a party, and in regard to an issue which required judicial decision, not compromise, and concerning which the Trustees announce that their mind is made up. The recalcitrancy and stubbornness do not appear to be on the side of Mr. Parsons in this matter, especially since he had stated, what was obviously enough the fact, that he must give most careful consideration to any proposal which might result from the mediation proceedings. To this committee, the "mediation" proposal and its sequel appear to be as unworthy an evasion of the essential demands of justice in this case, as the earlier "reinstatement" had been.

The committee also find that the preceding narrative of the dealings of the Trustees with this case shows that at no time have adequate hearings been afforded or offered to Dean Parsons; but that on the contrary the Trustees have disregarded or refused requests and opportunities for such hearings, both formal and informal; that the two settlements for the controversy proposed by them have been of such a nature that Dean Parsons could not reasonably be expected to accept them; but that on the contrary the Trustees have not accepted reasonable proposals, including judicial arbitration, made by Dean Parsons and his friends. The Trustees have no ground, therefore, for their complaint in regard to the behavior of Dean Parsons subsequent to his dismissal, quoted at the beginning of this section of the report.

In regard to President Duniway in particular, your committee feel that he has not shown a sufficient sense of his special personal and official responsibility to bring about an adequate judicial hearing of the case of Dean Parsons. A Board of Trustees cannot absolve a college president from responsibility for the moral debts of the institution, on the ground that those debts were contracted by them before his appointment. He accepts the debts with the office. And, as the head of the faculty, as well, President Duniway incurred a special responsibility towards those of its members, most of them professors of long and honorable service, who felt that

their honor had been attacked, along with that of Mr. Parsons, by the circumstances of his dismissal, since they had acted with him during the two years preceding. President Duniway attempted to satisfy these responsibilities by various compromises. The event has proved once more that such controversies cannot be settled in this way; what the Trustees did in July, 1917, made compromise impossible.

The committee must also regretfully report that, in spite of repeated requests, President Duniway has been of little assistance to it. The few letters and documents he has supplied refer wholly to the time since the dismissal of Mr. Parsons; and he has tacitly shared in the refusal of the Board of Trustees to participate or assist in this investigation.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The committee finds that the charges of Dean Parsons and his friends against the Board of Trustees of Colorado College are sustained, in that:

(1) The manner of the dismissal of Dean Parsons was arbitrary and unjust. No charges were stated, and no hearing given. The circumstances at the time did not require haste, and did not excuse the injustice of this procedure in any way. The Trustees have maintained their unjust and arbitrary attitude since that time, and have refused or evaded requests and opportunities for a just hearing, on stated charges, in the presence of third parties. They have also refused to take any part in the present investigation, or to make official statement to this committee, to the alumni, or to Dean Parsons himself, of any specific charges against him.

(2) It is morally certain that the chief immediate cause of the action of the Trustees in dismissing Dean Parsons was resentment at the part which he had taken in urging and bringing about the resignation of President W. F. Slocum. Dean Parsons had as colleagues in this course of action three other members of the College faculty, who shared in the responsibility for all decisions taken. The committee believes that, under the circumstances at the time, these four professors were reasonably warranted in their sincere conviction that the immediate resignation of all control of the internal affairs of the College by the President was necessary in the interests of the institution. Two of the trustees originally informed told these men that they concurred with this judgment; they also entered

into an agreement with them in regard to the retirement of the President from active control, and, somewhat later, from office. This agreement was not carried out until a vigorous protest was made to the Board at large, by a larger group of faculty members. These Trustees seem not to have frankly stated to the faculty members concerned, either their own change of attitude, or the reasons for this change. The Trustees, therefore, had no just ground of complaint in regard to the insistence of Dean Parsons that the President should retire.

(3) Various other complaints of the Trustees against Dean Parsons, so far as they are discoverable, or susceptible of exact investigation, appear to the committee either not to be sustained by the evidence, or, in so far as they are sustained, to be trivial and inconsequential.

(4) The acts of the Trustees since the dismissal, and more recently those of President Duniway, have shown that the administration of Colorado College did not desire any fair, complete or genuinely judicial investigation of the case of Dean Parsons to take place.

The committee feels constrained to remark, further, that the attitude of the majority of the members of the Board of Trustees and of the Board as a body towards the faculty has been characterized by grave courtesy, a lack of openness and candor, and an habitual disregard of the fact that the administrative officers and teaching staff of a college have large and definite moral responsibilities in relation to the internal conditions and standards of the institution with which they are connected.

Respectfully submitted:

F. S. DEIBLER, JOHN L. LOWES,*

GEORGE LEFEVRE, H. A. MILLER,

EDMUND H. HOLLANDS, *Chairman.*

*I concur in the findings of the foregoing report, with the following reservation for which the committee as a whole is not to be held responsible.

No non-delegated body within a faculty, however sincere its convictions, has a right to assume functions which properly belong to the faculty as a whole, or to some responsible committee chosen by it. In the present case, for a period extending over months, a self-constituted and later self-enlarged body, the so-called "faculty group," without authority from or consultation with the faculty as such, took steps and carried on negotiations which vitally affected the general interests of the College. This procedure is undoubtedly explicable throughout,

By direction of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, I have, as acting chairman of the committee, examined the report of the Committee of Inquiry on conditions in Colorado College, and have also examined the entire body of testimony in the case. I find the procedure of the committee to be in accord with the principles adopted by the General Committee, and in behalf of the latter committee approve the publication of the report.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY,

*President of the Association and Acting Chairman of the Committee
on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure.*

and may at the very outset have been rendered necessary, by the delicacy and difficulty of the situation which existed, and the sincerity of the motives leading to it is not impugned. But these considerations do not alter the fundamental principle involved, or, in my opinion, relieve the policy as such from condemnation, as in essence (even when not in intention) subversive of the rights and the authority of a faculty.

JOHN L. LOWES.

APPENDIX A

July 10, 1917.

PROFESSOR FRANK THILLY,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Thilly:

I am sending you this afternoon a telegram appealing to the American Association of University Professors for an investigation on behalf of Professor Albright and myself whose resignations have been requested in my case, and suggested in his. We were given no hearing whatever. I enclose a copy of the statement which has been published in one of the Colorado papers which will give you my own estimate of the reasons for the demand of the resignations. Other members of the faculty are writing to you from their point of view. We hope that the investigation may be prompt and thorough and that it may cover the whole very disagreeable situation at Colorado College. This is asked not so much for ourselves as for the good of the other members of the faculty and of the institution itself, the future of which is in grave danger.

Hoping the Association will see its way clear to grant this request and investigate the situation in the very near future, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD S. PARSONS.

July 11, 1917.

PROFESSOR FRANK THILLY,
President of the American Association of University Professors.

Dear Sir:

Other members of the Faculty of Colorado College have already communicated with you and set forth the circumstances which have caused the Trustees of Colorado College to dismiss Dean Edward S. Parsons and to ask for the resignation of Professor Guy H. Albright. In my judgment the two men have received unjust treatment. I hope the American Association of University Professors will assume the burden of making a speedy and thorough investigation, for the future good, not only of professors at Colorado College, but professors throughout the country. When a dean who has given twenty-five years of able and loyal service to an institution is dismissed without specific statement, in writing, of the charges against him and without a judicial hearing, then the time has arrived for a public investigation.

I am, very sincerely yours,

FLORIAN CAJORI,
Chairman of Local Chapter, A. A. U. P.

WOODLAND PARK, COLORADO, July 12, 1917.

PROFESSOR FRANK THILLY,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

Dear Professor Thilly:

We are informed that Dean Edward S. Parsons of Colorado College has communicated with you, requesting an investigation by the American Association of

University Professors of affairs at the College, because the Board of Trustees has dismissed him from the institution. We herewith request the Association to undertake this investigation. . . .

The Trustees failed completely to make any but the most vague charges against Dean Parsons. . . . We believe that Dean Parsons and Professor Albright have at no time been guilty of conduct justifying dismissal from the institution. We wish, moreover, to state that both stand high in the respect and esteem of the Faculty, alumni and students of the College, and have been most loyal and devoted in their service to the institution. We regard the dismissal of Dean Parsons and the notice served upon Professor Albright as grossly unjust. We believe further that the attack upon these men is in essence an attack upon practically a majority of the faculty, and therefore request that the scope of the investigation be made broad enough to include the whole situation at the College beginning with the circumstances that led to Dr. Slocum's resignation.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE M. HOWE.
HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE.

1205 Wood Avenue,
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

PROFESSOR FRANK THILLY,
President of the American Association of College Professors.

Dear Sir:

A telegram has informed you that the Trustees of Colorado College were threatening to dismiss Dean Edward S. Parsons and Professor G. H. Albright. In the case of Professor Parsons the dismissal is now an accomplished fact. . . . Bureaucratic methods were used. . . . The cases had been prejudged and the verdict rendered without any chance being given for a hearing. . . . I have been a colleague of Dean Parsons here for twenty-five years, and of Professor Albright for the ten years since he came to Colorado College. There are no men on any faculty who are more open-minded, more sympathetic with students, more idealistic and devoted in all their college and personal life. To say that one cannot work with either of them is to judge oneself. This Trustee action arises, in the opinion of the faculty, not in the reasons given, but from the resentment of the Trustees at the active participation of these men in the movement which resulted in President Slocum's resignation.

Very truly yours,

ATHERTON NOYES,
Professor of English.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., July 12, 1917.

PRESIDENT FRANK THILLY,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

My dear Sir:

At a special meeting of the Pike's Peak Chapter of the Colorado College Alumni Association, called and presided over by the president, Mr. William Jackson, Jr.,

on July 11, the secretary was instructed to send to you copies of the letters which they unanimously voted to send to Dean Edward S. Parsons and Professor Guy H. Albright. I enclose the same herewith.

Yours very truly,

LILLIAN JOHNSON.

*Acting Secretary, Pike's Peak Chapter, Colorado College Alumni Association.
Association of American University Professors.*

(Western Union Telegram.)

DENVER, COLO., July 19-17.

PROFESSOR FRANK THILLY,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

The Denver branch of Colorado College Alumni Association expresses confidence in pending investigation of affairs at Colorado College by American Association of University Professors, and respectfully urges that this be made with the utmost thoroughness and as soon as possible.

ALBERT WASLEY,
President.

APPENDIX B

July 17, 1917.

MR. IRVING HOWBERT,
Member of Board of Trustees, Colorado College,
Colorado Springs, Colo.

My dear Sir:

We, the undersigned, desire to enter our protest against the singling out of one man of the faculty of Colorado College from the group of four who found it necessary in December, 1915, to take up the charges against our former President. As you know, the group of four consisted of Cajori, Hills, Parsons, and Schneider. These men worked together from December, 1915, to August, 1916, and have equally shared in the initiative which led to the knowledge of the case being brought to three of the Trustees. In all that we have done, each is equally responsible. We do not believe that the action of these four men was a breach of loyalty to the institution; these men were confronted with a difficult and disagreeable duty. However, if it were true that they were overzealous and disloyal, why single out *one* of the group for punishment?

We protest, moreover, against the action which some members of the Board of Trustees have taken since July 7, 1917.

These Trustees dismissed Dean Parsons without giving him a written statement of the specific charges against him and even without giving him an oral statement of them.

The Trustees repeatedly refused to give him a hearing. They gave Professor Albright "permission to resign" also before he had had a hearing.

The Trustees refused to go over the charges, with the Faculty, for the purpose of ascertaining the *exact facts*. One of the undersigned had informed the Trustees that, to the best of his knowledge, the charges which they had named to him against Dean Parsons were not true. In one instance Dean Parsons has suffered

from the excessive zeal of one of his "friends." Recently that "friend" informed one of the undersigned that he had been advancing the cause of Dean Parsons by telling people he met in town the stories about our former President. That "friend" acted without the consent of Dean Parsons or of the undersigned. It is easy to see how, in an uncritical investigation such as the Trustees seem to have made, Dean Parsons might appear guilty of acts committed by his "friend."

The Trustees knew that statements about Dean Parsons and the faculty of Colorado College were printed in the *Evening Telegraph* of July 9, 1917. Some of the statements were altogether erroneous, causing Dean Parsons, Professor Albright, and the Faculty to appear in a wrong light before the public. Yet the Trustees did not correct the false statements, and the Faculty were refused the columns of our local press. In this matter the Trustees permitted the public to gain the impression:

- (1) That the Faculty was disrupted, when, as a matter of fact, for years it has not been as harmonious as now;
- (2) That Dean Parsons and Professor Albright are the cause of discord among the Faculty, when (barring perhaps one man) there is no discord;
- (3) That the alumni brought charges of disloyalty against Dean Parsons, when, as a matter of fact, no member of the Faculty is held in higher esteem and love by the alumni than is Dean Parsons.

We feel that such unfair and unjust methods of procedure in the dismissal of professors and in dealing with the faculty should not prevail in a higher institution of learning of a democratic country like the United States.

These are strong words and it is with regret and pain that we write them. But in the interest of the future of Colorado College and of the professorial profession in our entire country, we deem it necessary to utter this protest.

We trust you will give this letter fair consideration and, as far as possible, rectify the wrong done.

Believe us, as ever, loyal workers for Colorado College.

Respectfully yours,

Signed: FLORIAN CAJORI.

EDWARD C. SCHNEIDER.

P. S.—The larger part of the contents of this letter was stated at the meeting, last Tuesday afternoon. We mail the letter, so that our joint views may be brought to your attention.

COLORADO SPRINGS,

July 21, 1917.

MR. P. B. STEWART,

Chairman of Executive Committee of Board of Trustees of Colorado College.

Dear Mr. Stewart:

In view of the fact that Dean E. S. Parsons has been dismissed without receiving a written statement of the specific charges against him, and without being given a fair and full hearing, we, the members of the Faculty Executive Committee, respectfully request the Board of Trustees to re-open the case of Dean Parsons.

Very respectfully yours,

FLORIAN CAJORI.

EDWARD C. SCHNEIDER.

APPENDIX C

(Circular letter of Trustees to Alumni, April, 1918.)

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,

April 5, 1918.

To the Alumni of Colorado College:

The Board of Trustees believe that the time has now come when it is proper to give you a brief statement on the affairs of the College with particular reference to the dismissal of Dean Parsons. They did not feel that they should address you on the subject so long as there were open questions respecting further hearings or settlement by mediation. In the present state of these matters it becomes proper to give you information which justifies your continued confidence in the moral, financial, and scholastic standards of the College.

In July, 1917, the Board were finally convinced that due regard for the maintenance of a unified and effective administration and a proper spirit of co-operation in the work of the College made it obligatory for them to sever the connection of Professor Parsons with the College. This final conclusion was the result of many experiences extending through a series of years and culminating in active antagonism to the Board during more than a year after the resignation of President Slocum. To put the matter in the form of a reply to assertions which have been widely circulated, the dismissal of Dean Parsons was not due to resentment against him for what he is alleged to have done in "saving the College on a moral issue despite the indifference of the Trustees." Neither was his dismissal due to resentment for his alleged "exposure of financial irregularities, which the Trustees condoned by a 'whitewashing' report." Both the alleged "moral issue" and the alleged "financial irregularities" (the latter after a full report from a certified public accountant) were fully and fairly considered by the Board when the allegations were made. The enviable reputation of the College for its moral and religious life and its financial administration was shown to be justified. In these matters, however, as in others, Mr. Parsons had proven himself unwilling, or at least unable, to co-operate with the Trustees in a spirit of loyalty to the College. Under trying circumstances, when President Slocum was absent and untiringly at work to complete an endowment campaign, and when the Board was entitled to the active support of every member of the faculty for the welfare of the College, Mr. Parsons opposed and endeavored to nullify the policies of the Trustees.

The procedure followed in the dismissal of Dean Parsons last July was summary in form, contrary to the customary practice of the College and to the policy approved by the Trustees and being maintained in its administration. This exceptional procedure was made necessary by the attitude and acts of Dean Parsons, since the Trustees were not willing to disregard their responsibilities and to subject themselves to a control to be imposed by Mr. Parsons. His actions then and since prove that he was not willing to submit his case to the decision of the Board of Trustees after hearings which they were always willing to hold. Nevertheless, the Trustees subsequently concluded that sound policy justified them in voting a formal reinstatement and leave of absence to be followed later by hearings before giving final judgment. Dean Parsons was at once assured in writing that if he accepted this reinstatement he would not again be dismissed

130 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

unless such action should appear to be necessary after a full hearing of his case. He not only declined the reinstatement, but announced his ultimatum that he would accept only "immediate, complete, and unconditional reinstatement" with the assurance that no charges against him would be revived.

Although this ultimatum could not be accepted by Trustees conscious of their moral and legal responsibilities, and although such a response might well have terminated efforts for other methods of settlement of controversy, the Trustees still pursued a conciliatory policy by a later offer to refer the whole matter to some disinterested mediator of eminent academic position for full investigation and report. Mr. Parsons considered this proposition for some weeks, being meanwhile advised by many Alumni and members of the Faculty to accept, and then declined to participate in mediation.

Fair-minded men must conclude from acts of Mr. Parsons himself that the judgment which led to his dismissal was right. No further consideration is being given or will be given to any proposals for his reinstatement in the faculty of Colorado College.

It is not the purpose of this statement to go into details or to set forth the evidence upon which the Board of Trustees took action. We think it sufficient to say that while we have attached no importance to mere rumor and gossip, we have given careful attention to every suggestion relating to the life and work of the College for which any person would take responsibility. We have acted under a deep sense of our obligations for the permanent good of the great institution of which we are Trustees. We have faith that our course will ultimately be approved by all right-minded men and women who are true friends of Colorado College.

GEO. W. BAILEY.
JUDSON M. BEMIS.*
JOHN CAMPBELL.
GEORGE A. FOWLER.
BENJAMIN GRIFFITH.
IRVING HOWBERT.
CHARLES M. MACNEILL.
HENRY McALLISTER, JR.
GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.
OLIVER H. SHOUP.
E. P. SHOVE.
PHILIP B. STEWART.
MAHLON D. THATCHER.
FRANK TRUMBULL.
WILLIAM M. VANCE.

* Mr. Bemis has resigned but the resignation has not yet been accepted.